DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 193 786 EA 013 054

TITLE	Organizing Schools for Supervision/Instructional Improvement. Overview of the Study.
INSTITUTION	Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Alexandria, Va.
PUB DATE	80
NOTE	200p.: Some pages may not reproduce clearly due to marginal legibility of original document.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Collective Bargaining; Curriculum Development; Decentralization; Declining Enrollment; Efficiency; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation; Inservice Education; Principals; *School Supervision; School Surveys; Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Supervision

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to assess current supervisory practice and assess the impact of certain factors on supervision: declining enrollments, declining budgets, collective bargaining, management efficiency studies, principals' inability to commit time to supervision, and decentralization. Data were gathered from 16 districts (urban, suburban, and medium size city), both through questionnaires and on-site interviews with teachers, teacher organization officers, supervisors, principals, assistant superintendents, and superintendents. Studied was the role of supervision (rather than the position of supervision) consisting of inservice programs, teacher evaluation, curriculum improvement, and instructional supervisory services. From analysis of the data, several best bets for improvement of supervisory services emerged: decentralization, building principals' further involvement in supervisory service, defining supervision so as to eliminate the evaluative aspect, and increasing opportunities for teachers to receive supervisory services of all kinds. (Author/MLF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED193786

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ORGANIZING SCHOOLS FOR SUPERVISION/INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT

OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

EA 013 054

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. S. Brandt
ASCD
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Executive Summary

In January, 1979, an ASCD committee met to design a study to (1) assess current supervisory practice and (2) assess the impact of certain factors on supervision: declining enrollments; declining budgets; collective bargaining; management efficiency studies; principal inability to commit time to supervision; and decentralization. Data were gathered from sixteen districts (urban, suburban and medium size city) both through questionnaires and on-site interviews from teachers, teacher organization officers, supervisors, principals, and assistant superintendents/superintendents. In order to answer these two concerns a definition of supervision had to be adopted. The committee elected to study the role of supervision (rather than the position of supervision) consisting of inservice, teacher evaluation, and curriculum improvement and instructional supervisory services. Due to the small number of school districts and the method by which the districts were selected, the findings of this study cannot be inferred to be representative of other districts; however, they may be considered as indications and as raising points to be explored by other districts similarly situated.

Current Supervisory Practice.

Current supervisory practice has not changed appreciably in the last five years. The most frequent supervisory services continue to be the conventional ones: inservice is dominated by one day workshops and programs; teacher evaluation, by superiors; curriculum improvement, by adapting curriculums to new materials and texts; and instructional improvement, by observation followed by a conference. Two-thirds lower in utilization were such supervisory practices as: inservice - observations by teachers of other teachers; teacher evaluation -

evaluation by pupils; curriculum improvement - developing new courses; instructional supervision - observation via clinical supervision.

All respondents were asked to rate the adequacy both of current supervisory services and compared to five years ago. Only one-third of the teachers and officers of teachers' associations reported that their needs were met to a substantial degree, either currently or compared to five years ago. Several possible correlates with high satisfaction were tested, with the only strong association being involvement - teachers who reported high involvement tended to report more satisfaction with supervisory services.

Responsibility for administering supervisory services was also tested by this study. Most respondents reported mixed responsibility between central offices, decentralized offices and buildings for curriculum, development, inservice, and instructional support services. Only evaluation of teachers was clearly seen as the exclusive responsibility of one management level - building level. School districts may wish to examine how effectively this shared responsibility is working.

The influence of current factors (declining enrollments, decentralization, management efficiency studies, collective bargaining, building principals' inability to give time to supervision and diminishing revenues) on perceptions of the effectiveness of supervisory services comprised the second part of this study. Declining enrollments had no effect according to both questionnaire and interview data. Decentralization yielded clear-cut support from questionnaire responses and less clear, but still supportive, replies from interviews. Management efficiency studies yielded mixed results with the conclusion that they don't seem to do any harm.

Collective bargaining results favored meet and confer agreements, followed by no formal agreements and master contract agreements which produced largely unfavorable ratings of supervisory services. As a group, principals reported more influence (and the influence was negative) on supervisory services than other groups. Questionnaire data did not reveal a relationship between building principal's ability to give time to supervision; however, site visits did find positive support for a building level focus for supervisory services and assumption of supervisory services by other groups, including principals. Diminishing revenues was not associated with perceptions of effectiveness on the questionnaire data, but was strongly associated by urban and suburban districts during interviews, even though five of the ten districts included in this study had experienced increases in per pupil expenditures.

From open-ended interviews data and analysis of questionnaire data, several best bets for improvement of supervisory services emerged: decentralization, building principals further involvement in supervisory services, defining supervison so as to eliminate the evaluative aspect and increasing opportunities for teachers to receive supervisory services of all kinds.

Organizing Schools for
Supervision/Instructional Improvement
Overview of the Study

In the fall of 1978, ASCD issued a call for proposals to study the question: "What is the impact (both pro and con) of decentralization, collective bargaining, management efficiency emphasis, building principals' inability to give time to supervision, declining enrollment and diminishing revenues on how schools are organizing to provide supervision /instructional improvement services?" Subsequently, a committee (Appendix A) met to design the study in January, 1979. An early concern of the committee was whether the role of supervision should be studied (as it is conducted by principals, supervisors, and others) or whether the position of supervisor should be studied (including such titles as consultants, educational specialists, coordinators, among others). The committee decided in favor of the former; thus this is a study of supervision as it is practiced by supervisors and principals, among others. The committee agreed on the following matrix (Table 1) that provided a definition of the supervision to be studied and formed the parameters of this research. School site visits (Appendix B) were conducted beginning spring, 1979 and ending January, 1980.

The study as ultimately approved by the committee was composed of the following:

1. Questionnaires for superintendents, assistant superintendents, supervisors (representative group), principals (representative group), and teachers (from the same buildings as the principals). (Appendix C)

Table 1

The Role of Supervision and Current Factors Influencing that Role

ROLE	INFLUENCING FACTORS					
	Decentralization	Collective Barganing	Management Efficiency	Building Principal's Supervision	Enrollment	Revenue
Staff Development						
Curriculum Development						
Instructional Development						
Supervisory Services						

2. A structured interview form used with all of the above group. (Appendix D).
3. A data sheet from each of the school districts on such matters as budget figures over the last five years, number of faculty employed over last five years, level of decentralization, and so forth. (Appendix E).

The data were gathered during a 1-2 day site visit by a member of the committee. Sites were chosen using one or more of the following criteria: geographical distribution, type (large urban, suburban, medium city), and/or personal knowledge of a committee member about the conditions in that district. Summary data are included in Appendix F.

Background

In his study of the fifty largest urban school districts, Cawelti (1975) found decentralization proceeding at an accelerating rate. Of the twenty-six which had some form of decentralization, fifteen had decentralized in the period 1970-1974. His study further revealed that decentralized offices did not have strong roles in curriculum or instructional matters, but rather, were providing stronger leadership in administrative matters. Bassett (1977) and Fisher (1977) have suggested that as a district decentralizes there is also a noticeable shift from an emphasis on formalism and technical matters to an emphasis on meaning, communication and personal relationships. This latter emphasis would certainly conform with the professional orientations of supervision and there was some interest in the study to see if this was so perceived in the decentralized districts. Stewart and Miskel (1977) tested the question of whether a move to decentralization would be perceived by teachers as contributing to school effectiveness. They found only partial support for their hypothesis. In the present study, there was some interest in testing the question in rather narrower terms; that is, whether decentralization was related in any way to perceptions of improved supervision by any of the groups sampled. While decentralization is primarily a larger city phenomena, four other cities were found that were also decentralized.

Perhaps two of the best established facts of the current education scene are that public school enrollments and budgets are declining and are expected to continue to decline at least through 1983 (U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1977). From 1970-1975, the decline in students (-2.3%) was not accompanied by a decline in teachers (+7.2%), the net effect being to reduce the pupil-teacher ratio from 22.3 in 1970 to 20.4 in 1975 (U.S. Department of HEW, 1976). During this same period, expenditures for the elementary and secondary education increased from 70 billion in 1970 to 80 billion in 1975, an increase of 12.5%. However, when this figure is adjusted for inflation, assuming an average inflation rate of 5.5%, the resulting figures show a decline in real schooling budgets of 11.47 billion or 12.6%. Schools have had to make adjustments in their expenditures and these adjustments had not been made by a reduction in teaching staff through 1975. Several authorities in the mid-1970's suggested the very real opportunities to improve services that declining enrollments permitted such as reducing pupil-teacher ratios, providing more specialized programs and even achieving more complete racial integration (Bailey, Fritschen, and All, 1978) and using unallotted space for other educational purposes, starting alternative education programs and sharing facilities with neighboring districts (Pack and Weiss, 1975). However, most of these suggestions would require stable or increasing budgets, something that has decidedly not occurred. Noting that from 1973 to 1978 500 public schools were forced to close and between 1972-1978, even such largely rural states as Iowa lost 30% of their enrollment, Bailey, Fritschen, and All project continuing financial problems as state aid formulas are based heavily on pupil counts (and the funding tends to be negatively weighted). For example, in Michigan a school system receives $325 in state aid for each pupil added, but loses $1,400 for each lost (Elam, 1978). Compounding the budget problems have been state mandates for required courses and services and P.L.94-142, usually without additional financial aid. The prospect of increased financial support for these mandated services is bleak, according to Bailey, Fritschen and All, in light of Proposition 13 - type movements in a number of states. In 1978 Phi Delta Kappan conducted an interview with the superintendents of Zivoniz, Michigan (a suburb system), New Orleans, Seattle and Salt Lake City schools (Elam, 1978). While each of these systems shared problems of declining enrollments, their specific problems and ways of coping with them differed. The major consensus of the panel, however, was that declining enrollments and resulting school closings and reduction or retraining of staff could best be met by improved programs such as special programs for the gifted, subsidiary services for students not on grade level, additional counseling services and increased services to adult populations (these services paid for by savings generated by school closings). These changes in program suggest a continuing need for supervisory personnel to implement and monitor these increased services.

Another concern of the study was the effect of collective bargaining on supervision. Today teachers are much better organized than they have ever been before and the teacher organizations are far more militant than previously. The deleterious effects that collective bargaining can have on the instructional program is outlined by Eiken. He relates instances in which teaching assignments are made on the basis of seniority; therefore, a desirable curriculum change must be dropped since the teacher in line to teach the class does not possess the requisite skills. Negotiated contracts that emphasize choice in inservice by their very nature negate the possibility of a systematic inservice focus aimed at bringing major change in an instructional program. Supervisors are prevented from gathering evaluation data on the effects of a special program because the negotiated agreement limits supervisory visits to those initiated by the teacher. Karlitz (1978) notes that while the traditional view of collective bargaining has been a conflict oriented view with each side maintaining an adversary position, this may be an early phase of a five stage development process. The final stage, characterized by the most mature collective bargaining situations is the "accommodation" stage. In this stage, bargained agreements may not be so precisely observed, but the end result is still an erosion of the curriculum/instructional prerogatives of administration as principals make accommodations impled or required in union contracts.

By contrast, the North Central Association commissioned a survey of administrators regarding their views of the effects of collective bargaining on a number of school factors. These administrators reported that among other areas, collective bargaining had had no effect on the instructional program, inservice programs, staff evaluation or curriculum planning. (Nighswander and Klahn, 1977).

Flam (1971) surveyed administrators and teachers in Oakland county, Michigan, on the impact of collective bargaining on inservice. He found teachers and administrators in agreement on some broad factors covering the effects of negotiations on inservice: (1) consideration of teacher preferences is becoming more prevalent, (2) teachers lack motivation to participate in the development of inservice, (3) the most effective inservice programs are built upon the teachers' expressed needs. Administrators and teachers tended to disagree on the importance of inservice, such as "specific inservice activities should be developed through professional negotiations" and "procedures for developing inservice should be clearly defined within the contract." This study of unionization in one school district suggests that while there are general agreements between teachers and administrators on the broad parameters of supervisory services, there are disagreements on the precise ways these shall be conducted.

A dialogue between the authors of a Rand study on the effects of negotiations and Lieberman, a sharp critic of teacher unions does little to clarify the matter. Lieberman charges the authors of the Rand study with whitewashing union activity, stating at one point, "Teachers' unions are clearly attempting to bargain for control or influence over new programs; such control or influence inevitably renders it more difficult for management to introduce such programs" (Lieberman, 1979). In defending their position that unionization is not harmful to education or the management process, McDonnell and Pascal state, "According to our respondents (who included large numbers of school administrators), collective bargaining is not a problem in most districts. Generally, it is simply viewed as a way to standardize labor/management relations" (1979).

Another focus of the study was the principals' continuing inability to devote time to instructional supervision. Roe and Drake (1974) have noted that, "It isn't enough to make a functional study of the principals' present activities as has been done so many times. It is already well known that principals spend most of their time on management details. Even in those studies which show instructional activities being performed, the depth and effectiveness of these efforts are not assessed." Traditionally the literature has called for a large role for the principal in instructional improvement and just as traditionally principals have generally been unable to commit much time to this function. The 1978 Study of the Principalship conducted by NAESP (1979) offers little hope that this situation will change substantially, noting that the percentage of elementary principals having responsibility for two buildings has risen from 8.8% in 1968 to 13.2% in 1978. A study of the principalship commissioned by the North Central Association of Schools and Colleges revealed that principals view their real and ideal role as administrative in nature. Instructional leadership was accorded a secondary role, both ideally and in practice, by school administrators surveyed. Surprisingly, even though the principals assigned second priority to their roles as instructional leaders, they assigned low priority to several specific functions that would appear to be part of an instructional leader's role--evaluating school programs, providing inservice education, and interviewing and recommending new personnel. More typical of the findings of those who study principal role perception are those reported by Purkerson (1977). In his study of Texas principals, they were asked to rank order the role of the principal twice-once in terms of the real role and once in terms of the ideal role. Instructional improvement was overwhelmingly rated number one "ideally" but only number five "really." The Association for California School Administrators has suggested why the ideal role differs so markely from the real role of the principal with regard to instructional improvement. They note as particular roadblocks principal lack of time, power, clear role definition and preparation (Mazzarella, 1977).

QUESTIONNAIRE DATA RESULTS

Analysis of Quantitative Data

Large City

Characteristics of Respondents.

Table 1 shows that the teachers were predominantly more experienced, with the largest group (42.0%) having 16 or more years' experience. Teachers' association officers also tended to be older with 50.0% having 16 or more years' experience. By contrast, supervisors, principals and even superintendents as a group were relatively less experienced in their positions having respectively 5-10 years of experience (supervisors 52.9% and principals 62.0%) and 11-15 years of experience (superintendents 60.0%).

As a group, teachers and principals were almost equally balanced between elementary and secondary. Supervisors, teachers' association officers and superintendents were heavily representative of the secondary level.

With respect to educational level, 59.1% of the teachers had graduate degrees; however, considering the high years of experience of this group, it is surprising that the percentage of graduate degrees is not higher. Virtually all of the rest of the respondents had graduate degrees, with 50% or more in each group having the Masters' plus 30 semester hours.

Supervisory Services.

It was deemed important to determine the predominant activities that comprise current supervisory services. The results of this inquiry are reported in Table 2. As in the rest of this study, supervision services were grouped

Table 1

Large City

Characteristics of Respondents

Characteristics	Category									
	N=357 Teachers		N=4 Teachers' Associations Officers		N=68 Supervisors		N=50 Principals		N=10 Superintendents	
Numbers of Years in Position	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
5-10	95	26.6			36	52.9	31	62.0	2	20.0
11-15	109	30.5	2	50.0	18	26.5	11	22.0	6	60.0
16+	150	42.0	2	50.0	12	17.6	8	16.0	1	10.0
No Response	3	0.8							1	10.0
Current School Level (Highest Level)										
Early Childhood	9	2.5			2	2.9	3	6.0		
Primary	80	22.4			1	1.5	4	8.0		
Upper Elementary	83	23.2			14	20.6	18	36.0	1	10.0
Middle School	27	7.6			4	5.9	5	10.0		
Junior High	72	20.2	2	50.0	29	42.6	8	16.0		
Senior High	70	19.6			18	26.5	11	22.0	5	50.0
Other	16	4.5	2	50.0			1	2.0	4	40.0
Highest Degree Held										
Bachelor's	144	40.3			6	8.8				
Master's	133	37.3	2	50.0	13	19.1	13	26.0		
Master's + 30 s.h.	75	21.0	2	50.0	40	58.8	32	64.0	[illegible]	40.0
Doctorate	3	0.8			9	13.2	5	10.0	6	60.0
No Response	2	0.6								

Table 2

Large City

Perceptions of Activities Involved in/Available During the Previous Three Years by Category of Respondent

Activity	Category									
	N=357 Teachers		N=4 Teachers' Association Officers		N=68 Supervisors		N=50 Principals		N=10 Superintendents	
In-service activity	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
One day demos, workshops conducted by public school personnel										
Yes	293	82.1	4	100.0	68	100.0	49	98.0	10	100.0
No	64	17.9					1	2.0		
Presentations by educational sales representatives										
Yes	164	45.9	1	25.0	57	83.8	23	46.0	8	80.0
No	193	54.1	3	75.0	11	16.2	27	54.0	2	20.0
One day programs by outside consultant										
Yes	195	54.6	1	25.0	60	88.2	43	86.00	9	90.0
No	162	45.4	3	75.0	8	11.8	7	14.0	1	10.0
In-classroom assistance in innovative teaching/using new materials										
Yes	115	32.2			54	79.4	32	64.0	7	70.0
No	242	67.8	4	100.0	14	20.6	18	36.0	3	30.0

Table 2 (continued)

Observations of other teachers										
Yes	125	35.0			65	95.6	43	86.0	8	80.0
No	232	65.0	4	100.0	3	4.4	7	14.0	2	20.0
Special college courses conducted at a local school by a college staff member										
Yes	103	28.9			40	58.8	22	44.0	7	70.0
No	254	71.1	4	100.0	28	41.2	28	56.0	3	30.0
Workshops, demos lasting more than one day and conducted by local or outside consultants										
Yes	178	49.9	3	75.0	60	88.2	33	66.0	9	90.0
No	179	50.1	1	25.0	8	11.8	17	34.0	1	10.0
Independent projects which are a part of a formal inservice program										
Yes	91	25.5			39	57.4	20	40.0	6	60.0
No	266	74.5	4	100.0	29	42.6	30	60.0	4	40.0
Other										
Yes	29	8.1			18	26.5	8	16.0	3	30.0
No	328	91.9	4	100.0	50	73.5	42	84.0	7	70.0
Teacher evaluation										
Evaluation by superior										
Yes	301	84.3	3	75.0	46	67.6	50	100.0	10	100.0
No	56	15.7	1	25.0	22	32.4				

Table 2 (continued)

Peer evaluation										
Yes	80	22.4			16	23.5	8	16.0	4	40.0
No	277	77.6	4	100.0	52	76.5	42	84.0	6	60.0
Self evaluation										
Yes	212	59.4	1	25.0	34	50.0	20	40.0	5	50.0
No	145	40.6	3	75.0	34	50.0	30	60.0	5	50.0
Evaluation by pupils										
Yes	73	20.4			6	8.8	6	12.0	3	30.0
No	284	79.6	4	100.0	62	91.2	44	88.0	7	70.0
Evaluation of classroom climate (as opposed to evaluation of the teacher)										
Yes	77	21.6			39	57.4	28	56.0	5	50.0
No	280	78.4	4	100.0	29	42.6	22	44.0	5	50.0
Other										
Yes	14	3.9			13	19.1	7	14.0	2	20.0
No	343	96.1	4	100.0	55	80.9	43	86.0	8	80.0
Curriculum improvement										
Developing new courses										
Yes	77	21.6			41	60.3	26	52.0	8	80.0
No	280	78.4	4	100.0	27	39.7	24	48.0	2	20.0
Writing competency criteria tests										
Yes	34	9.5			32	47.1	6	12.0	9	90.0
No	323	90.5	4	100.0	36	52.9	44	88.0	1	10.0

Table 2 (continued)

Adapting a curriculum to new materials, text, or approaches										
Yes	169	47.3	2	50.0	55	80.9	31	62.0	9	90.0
No	188	52.7	2	50.0	13	19.1	19	38.0	1	10.0
Developing new curriculum guides										
Yes	101	28.3	1	25.0	58	85.3	19	38.0	10	100.0
No	256	71.7	3	75.0	10	14.7	31	62.0		
Selecting a new curriculum program										
Yes	91	25.5	3	75.0	42	61.8	21	42.0	4	40.0
No	266	74.5	1	25.0	26	38.2	29	58.0	6	60.0
Other										
Yes	27	7.6	1	25.0	20	29.4	6	12.0	3	30.0
No	330	92.4	3	75.0	48	70.6	44	88.0	7	70.0
Instructional supervision services										
Clinical supervision (pre-conference observation, follow-up conference										
Yes	50	14.6			33	48.5	28	56.0	8	80.0
No	305	85.4	4	100.0	35	51.5	22	44.0	2	20.0
Observation followed by a conference										
Yes	141	39.5	1	25.0	52	76.5	50	100.0	7	70.0
No	214	59.9	3	75.0	16	23.5			3	30.0
No Response	2	0.6								

Table 2 (continued)

Supplementary materials based on a knowledge of your goals, and problems										
Yes	141	39.5	2	50.0	58	85.3	40	80.0	7	70.0
No	214	59.9	2	50.0	10	14.7	10	20.0	3	30.0
No Response	2	0.6								
Audio-Visual										
Yes	97	27.2	1	25.0	50	73.5	33	66.0	7	70.0
No	258	72.3	3	75.0	18	26.5	17	34.0	3	30.0
No Response	2	0.6								
Changes in teaching procedures, approaches										
Yes	90	25.2	1	25.0	56	82.4	41	82.0	6	60.0
No	265	74.2	3	75.0	12	17.6	9	18.0	4	40.0
No Response	2	0.6								
Reinforcement for teaching procedures, & approaches										
Yes	128	35.9	1	25.0	50	73.5	37	74.0	7	70.0
No	227	63.6	3	75.0	18	26.5	13	26.0	3	30.0
No Response	2	0.6								
Other										
Yes	8	2.2	1	25.0	4	5.9	4	8.0	1	10.0
No	343	96.1	3	75.0	63	92.6	46	92.0	9	90.0
No Response					1	1.5				

into four categories - inservice, teacher evaluation, curiculum improvement, and instructional supervision services.

All respondent groups agreed that one day workshops, one day programs, and workshops lasting more than one day were the predominant inservice activities. Widely discrepant data were found for teachers and teachers' association officers representatives responses about participation versus responses by supervisors, principals, and superintendents with respect to presentations by sales representatives, in-classroom assistance, special college courses and independent projects. In each instance, the latter group reported much higher participation rates than the former group.

Evaluation by a superior is overwhelmingly the predominant teacher evaluation procedure as agreed by all groups. Self evaluation by teachers is the next most frequent evaluation procedure mentioned by teachers (59.4%) but no other respondent group gives it more than a 50% rating. Additionally, supervisors (57.4%), principals (56.0%) and superintendents (50.0%) were more likely to cite classroom climate as an evaluation vehicle as opposed to teachers (21.6%) and teachers' association officers (0.0%). None of the other evaluation procedures received a very high percentage of respondents from any category.

The question on curriculum improvement stimulated widely varying respondents. In no category did as many as 51% of the teachers or officers of teachers' association indicate participation. By contrast, over 51% of the supervisors and superintendents indicated participation in four of the five activities listed. The only category that even approached the 51% mark by teachers was for adapting a curriculum to new materials (47.3%).

As in curriculum improvement, no percentage of responses by teachers or officers of teachers' association type of service reached the 51% participation level - the highest were 39.5% (teachers) and 50% (officers of teachers' association) for both observation followed by a conference (teachers only) and a recommending supplementary materials. By contrast, over 50% of the supervisors and principals indicated participation in five of the six instructional supervison services, the only exception being clinical supervision. In the group of superintendents respondents, 60.0% to 80.0% indicated district participation in all of the instruction supervision services, including clinical supervision.

Factors that Have Been the Focus of Instructional Improvement Efforts.

Specific factors that have been the focus of instructional improvement are reported in Table 3. All factors except two, use of audio-visual materials and the making of bulletin boards, were reported by a majority of all groups as focuses for instructional improvement efforts. The only exception to this generalization was the teachers' association officers, 100% of whom felt that the making of bulletin boards had been a focus and abundance of materials had not been a focus.

Respondents were polled about the degree to which teachers' needs were being met currently and compared to five years ago. Their responses are reported in Tables 4 and 5. By omitting response choice 3, trends in responses can be determined, and this information is reported in Table 6. In no category of services by any group doing the rating did scores for meeting teacher needs, either currently or in comparison to five years ago, reach the 51% mark with three exceptions - superintendents on three of five categories, supervisors in one category (inservice), and principals in one category (curriculum improvement). Considering supervisory services as a whole, teachers, supervisors and superintendents saw the services as better than five years ago, although superintendents were the only respondent category 51% or more of whom

Table 3

Large City

Perception of Focus of Instructional Improvement Efforts by Principals, Supervisors, or Others by Category of Respondents

Focus	Category									
	N=357 Teachers		N=4 Teachers' Association Officers		N=68 Supervisors		N=50 Principals		N=10 Superintendents	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
High expectations of pupils by teachers										
Yes	238	66.7	1	25.0	50	73.5	40	80.0	8	80.0
No	112	31.3	3	75.0	17	25.0	10	20.0	2	20.0
No Response	7	2.0			1	1.5				
Teacher enthusiasm										
Yes	219	61.3	4	100.0	42	61.8	32	64.0	4	40.0
No	133	37.3			26	38.2	17	34.0		
No Response	5	1.4					1	2.0	6	60.0
Instruction in the use of audio-visual materials, equipment										
Yes	123	34.5	2	50.0	34	50.0	21	42.0	5	50.0
No	230	64.4	2	50.0	34	50.0	28	56.0	5	50.0
No Response	4	1.1					1	2.0		
Emphasis on task orientation by teacher										
Yes	196	54.9	3	75.0	51	75.0	36	72.0	8	80.0
No	155	43.4	1	25.00	17	25.0	13	26.0	2	20.0
No Response	6	1.7					1	2.0		

Table 3 (continued)

Individualizing instruction										
Yes	251	70.3	3	75.0	58	85.3	44	88.0	9	90.0
No	102	28.6	1	25.0	10	14.7	6	12.0	1	10.0
No Response	4	1.1								
Classroom climate of warmth, support, mutual respect										
Yes	264	73.9	2	50.0	52	76.5	43	86.0	9	90.0
No	89	24.9	2	50.0	16	23.5	6	12.0	1	10.0
No Response	4	1.1					1	2.0		
Abundance of materials in classrooms available for use by teachers and pupils										
Yes	156	43.7			46	67.6	32	64.0	8	80.0
No	197	55.2	4	100.0	22	32.4	17	34.0	2	20.0
No Response	4	1.1					1	2.0		
Emphasis on pupil activities in classroom vs. pupil passivity										
Yes	232	65.0	3	75.0	56	82.4	40	80.0	8	80.0
No	121	33.9	1	25.0	12	17.6	9	18.0	2	20.0
No Response	4	1.1					1	2.0		
The making and use of bulletin boards										
Yes	124	34.7	4	100.0	17	25.0	16	32.0	1	10.0
No	228	63.9			51	75.0	33	66.0	9	90.0
No Response	5	1.4					1	2.0		

Table 4

Large City

Perception of Extent to Which Teachers' Needs are Currently Met by Supervisory Services by Category of Respondents

Service		Category N=357 Teachers		N=4 Teachers' Association Officers		N=68 Supervisors		N=50 Principals		N=10 Superintendents	
In-Service		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Low	1	58	16.2	2	50.0	6	8.8	2	4.0		
	2	63	17.6	1	25.0	15	22.1	7	14.0		
	3	132	37.0			24	35.3	21	42.0	7	70.0
	4	66	18.5	1	25.0	16	23.5	19	38.0	2	20.0
High	5	35	9.8			7	10.3	1	2.0	1	10.0
No Response	6	3	0.8								
Teacher Evaluation											
Low	1	59	16.5	3	75.0	5	7.4	4	8.0		
	2	52	14.6			19	27.9	12	24.0	3	30.0
	3	117	32.8	1	25.0	22	32.4	17	34.0	3	30.0
	4	75	21.0			17	25.0	16	32.0	4	40.0
High	5	49	13.7			1	1.5	1	2.0		
No Response	6	5	1.4			4	5.9				
Curriculum Improvement											
Low	1	58	16.2			1	1.5	3	6.0		
	2	68	19.0	1	25.0	11	16.2	13	26.0	1	10.0
	3	124	34.7	3	75.0	28	41.2	17	34.0	4	40.0
	4	76	21.3			24	35.3	14	28.0	3	30.0
High	5	24	6.7			4	5.9	3	6.0	2	20.0
No Response	6	7	2.0								

Table 4 (continued)

							Superv		Principals		
Instructional Supervision Services											
Low	1	62	17.4	1	25.0	6	8.8	6	12.0	1	10.0
	2	50	14.0	2	50.0	15	22.1	11	22.0	1	10.0
	3	145	40.6	1	25.0	28	41.2	22	44.0	5	50.0
	4	58	~~16.2~~ 25			12	~~17.6~~ 26	11	22.0	3	30.0
High	5	31	8.7			6	8.8				
No Response	6	11	3.1			1	1.5				
All Supervisory Services Considered as a Whole											
Poor	1	39	10.9	1	25.0	7	10.3	3	6.0		
	2	73	20.4	1	25.0	17	25.0	13	26.0	1	10.0
	3	130	36.4	2	50.0	24	35.3	20	40.0	3	30.0
	4	59	16.5			15	22.1	13	26.0	5	50.0
Excellent	5	50	14.0			3	4.4	1	2.0	1	10.0
No Response	6	6	1.7			2	2.9				

Table 5

Large City

Perception of Extent to Which Teachers' Needs are Met by Supervisory Services Compared to Five Years Ago by Category of Respondents

Service		Category									
		N=357 Teachers		N=4 Teachers' Association Officers		N=68 Supervisors		N=50 Principals		N=10 Superintendents	
In-Service		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Low	1	50	14.0	1	25.0	2	2.9	2	4.0		
	2	50	14.0	2	50.0	16	23.5	9	18.0	2	20.0
	3	115	32.2			12	17.6	15	30.0	1	10.0
	4	71	19.9	1	25.0	33	48.5	20	40.0	3	30.0
High	5	45	12.6			5	7.4	3	6.0	4	40.0
No Response	6	26	7.3					1	2.0		
Teacher Evaluation											
Low	1	49	13.7	2	50.0	2	2.9	2	4.0		
	2	40	11.2	1	25.0	15	22.1	10	20.0	1	10.0
	3	137	38.4	1	25.0	24	35.3	15	30.0	4	40.0
	4	57	16.0			22	32.4	18	36.0	4	40.0
High	5	48	13.4			3	4.4	5	10.0	1	10.0
No Response	6	26	7.3			2	2.9				
Curriculum Improvement											
Low	1	50	14.0			1	1.5	2	4.0		
	2	51	14.3	2	50.0	13	19.1	4	8.0		
	3	117	32.8			22	32.4	14	28.0	3	30.0
	4	65	18.2	1	25.0	21	30.9	28	56.0	4	40.0
High	5	45	12.6	1	25.0	10	14.7	2	4.0	3	30.0
No Response	6	29	8.1			1	1.5				

Table 5 (continued)

Instructional Supervision Services											
Low	1	46	12.9	1	25.0	5	74	3	6.0	1	10.0
	2	54	15.1	1	25.0	17	25.0	11	22.0	1	10.0
	3	125	35.0	1	25.0	19	27.9	18	36.0	3	30.0
	4	60	16.8	1	25.0	19	27.9	17	34.0	3	30.0
High	5	43	12.0			6	8.8	1	2.0	2	20.0
No Response	6	29	8.1			2	2.9				
All Supervisory Services Considered as a Whole											
Poorer	1	35	9.8	1	25.0	5	7.4	5	10.0		
	2	45	12.6	1	25.0	17	25.0	14	28.0	1	10.0
	3	134	37.5	1	25.0	18	26.5	15	30.0	1	20.0
	4	58	16.2	1	25.0	18	26.5	13	26.0	5	50.0
Better	5	60	16.8			8	11.8	3	6.0	2	20.0
No Response	6	25	7.0			2	2.9				

Table 6

Large City

A Comparison of the Perceptions of the Extent to Which Teachers' Needs are Met by Supervisory Services Compared to Five Years Ago by Category of Respondents

Service		Category									
		N=357 Teachers		N=4 Teachers' Association Officers		N=68 Supervisors		N=50 Principals		N=10 Superintendents	
In-Service		Now	5 Yrs. Ago	Now	5 Yrs. Ago	Now	5 Yrs. Ago	Now	5 Yrs. Ago	Now	5 Yrs. Ago
Low	1,2	33.8	28.0	75.0	75.0	30.9	26.4	18.0	22.0	0	20.0
High	4,5	28.3	32.5	25.0	25.0	33.8	55.9	40.0	46.0	30.0	70.0
Teacher Evaluation											
Low	1,2	31.1	24.9	75.0	75.0	35.3	25.0	32.0	24.0	30.0	10.0
High	4,5	34.7	29.4	25.0	0	26.5	36.8	34.0	46.0	40.0	50.0
Curriculum Improvement											
Low	1,2	35.2	28.3	25.0	50.0	17.7	20.6	32.0	12.0	10.0	0
High	4,5	28.0	30.8	0	50.0	41.2	45.6	34.0	60.0	50.0	70.0
Instructional Supervision Services											
Low	1,2	31.4	28.0	75.0	50.0	30.9	32.4	34.0	28.0	20.0	20.0
High	4,5	24.9	28.8	0	25.0	26.4	36.7	22.0	36.0	30.0	50.0
All Supervisory Services Considered as a Whole											
Poorer	1,2	31.3	22.4	50.0	50.0	35.3	32.4	32.0	38.0	10.0	10.0
Better	4,5	30.5	33.0	0	25.0	26.5	38.3	28.0	32.0	60.6	70.0

rated the services as better. Principals and officers of teachers' association saw the srevices as poorer than five years ago.

Responsibility for Various Supervisory Functions by Level of School Organization.

An effort was made in the survey to determine various respondents' viewpoints regarding organizational responsibility for the four supervisory functions - staff development, teacher evaluation, curriculum improvement, and instructional supervision (Tables 7, 8, 9). Most respondents agreed that the central office had shared responsibility for these functions with two exceptions: with respect to teacher evaluation, a majority of all groups except superintendents felt the central office had no responsibility and 70% of the superintendents felt the central office had primary or sole responsibility for curriculum improvement contrasted to a majority of the other groups that did not so feel.

Most groups saw decentralized offices having shared responsibility for all supervisory functions except teacher evaluation, where they tended to see limited or no responsibility. A higher percentage of superintendents tended to see shared responsibility for decentralized offices than did other groups.

Shared responsibility also was the primary response category for most groups in assessing the building principals' role in the various supervisory functions. The only exception to this generalization was teacher evaluation where a large majority of all groups saw this as the primary or sole responsibility of the building principal. A majority of the building principals also saw themselves as having primary or sole responsibility for instructinal supervision; however, a majority of other groups did not so concur.

Table 7

Large City

Perceived Amount of Responsibility Assumed for Various Supervisory Functions by Level of School Organization by Category of Respondents

Level-Central Office

Function	Category									
	N=357 Teachers		N=4 Teachers' Association Officers		N=68 Supervisors		N=50 Principals		N=10 Superintendents	
Staff Development	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	41	11.5	1	25	13	19.1	3	6	3	30
2	151	42.3	2	50	43	63.2	38	76	7	70
3	94	26.3	1	25	10	14.7	5	10		
4	4	1.1			0	0	1	2		
5	67	18.8			2	2.9	3	6		
Teacher Evaluation										
1	13	3.6			5	7.4	3	6		
2	69	19.3	1	25	19	27.9	14	28	7	70
3	167	46.8	3	75	38	55.9	27	54	3	30
4	10	2.8			4	5.9	2	4		
5	98	27.5			2	2.9	4	8		
Curriculum Improvement Projects										
1	74	20.7	2	50	24	35.3	14	28	7	70
2	163	45.7	1	25	41	60.3	32	64	2	20
3	50	14.0	1	25	1	1.5	3	6	1	10
4	3	.8			0	0	1	2		
5	67	18.8			2	2.9	0	0		
Instructional Supervision										
1	24	6.7	2	50	11	16.2	3	6	3	30
2	115	32.2	2	50	42	61.8	21	42	7	70
3	119	33.3			11	16.2	22	44		
4	7	2.0			1	1.5	1	2		
5	92	25.8			3	4.4	3	6		

1=Primary or sole responsibility
2=Shared responsibility
3=Limited or no responsibility
4=Not applicable
5=Missing data

Table 8

Large City

Perceived Amount of
Responsibility Assumed for Various Supervisory
Functions by Level of School Organization by Category of Respondents

Level-Decentralized Offices

Function	N=357 Teachers		N=4 Teachers' Association Officers		N=68 Supervisors		N=50 Principals		N=10 Superintendents	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Staff Development										
1	16	4.5	2	50	3	4.4	0	0	0	0
2	111	31.1	2	50	33	48.5	24	48	7	70
3	48	13.4			7	10.3	1	2	1	10
4	80	22.4			13	19.1	16	32	1	10
5	102	28.6			12	17.6	9	18	1	10
Teacher Evaluation										
1	8	2.2			1	1.5	1	2	1	10
2	69	19.3	2	50	20	29.4	13	26	6	60
3	84	23.5	2	50	19	27.9	11	22	1	10
4	82	23.0			14	20.6	15	30	1	10
5	114	31.9			14	20.6	10	20	1	10
Curriculum Improvement Projects										
1	27	7.6			3	4.4	0	0	1	10
2	127	35.6	3	75	31	45.6	23	46	7	70
3	32	9.0	1	25	9	13.2	2	4	0	0
4	76	21.3			12	17.6	15	30	1	10
5	95	26.6			13	19.1	10	20	1	10
Instructional Supervision										
1	16	4.5	1	25	6	8.8	2	4	4	40
2	99	27.7	3	75	28	41.2	20	40	3	30
3	61	17.1			8	11.8	3	6	1	10
4	77	21.6			12	17.6	15	30	1	10
5	104	29.1			14	20.6	10	20	1	10

1=Primary or sole responsibility
2=Shared responsibility
3=Limited or no responsibility
4=Not applicable
5=Missing data

Table 9

Large City

Perceived Amount of Responsibility Assumed for Various Supervisory Functions by Level of School Organization by Category of Respondents

Level-Building Principal

Function	Category N=357 Teachers		N=4 Teachers' Association Officers		N=68 Supervisors		N=50 Principals		N=10 Superintendents	
Staff Development	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	91	25.5			4	5.9	8	16	3	30
2	178	49.9	2	50	52	76.5	40	80	6	60
3	28	7.8	2	50	8	11.8			1	10
4										
5	60	16.8			4	5.9	2	4		
Teacher Evaluation										
1	232	65.0	3	75	49	72.1	38	76	8	80
2	74	20.7	1	25	16	23.5	11	22	1	10
3	9	2.5			1	1.5			1	10
4										
5	42	11.8			2	2.9	1	2		
Curriculum Improvement Projects										
1	34	9.5					2	4	1	10
2	181	50.7	2	50	47	69.1	41	82	8	80
3	66	18.5	2	50	17	25.0	4	8	1	10
4	2	0.6								
5	74	20.7			4	5.9	3	6		
Instructional Supervision										
1	125	35.0	1	25	23	33.8	31	62		
2	146	40.9	1	25	37	54.4	18	36	7	70
3	21	5.9	2	50	4	5.9			3	30
4										
5	65	18.2			4	5.9	1	2		

1=Primary or sole responsibility
2=Shared responsibility
3=Limited or no responsibility
4=Not applicable
5=Missing data

Medium-size City

Characteristics of Respondents.

Teachers in the respondent group for medium-size city were almost evenly spread beetween the three groupings for number of years in position (Table 10). However this was not true for principals, 54.3% of whom had 5-10 years of experience or supervisors 42.9% of whom had 5-10 years of experience. Officers of teachers' associations as a group had the largest percentage with over 16 years of experience, 47.1%

Level of school experience (highest grade) tended to be slightly skewed toward secondary with 50.9% of the teachers at the secondary level; 50.0% of the principals; and 56.2% of the supervisors.

Teachers in the respondent group tended to have graduate degrees (52.1%) with high percentages of all other groups having graduate degrees. Superintendents had the highest percentage of higher degrees followed by principals, supervisors, officers of teachers' associations and teachers.

Supervisory Services.

Respondents were asked to indicate their participation in current supervisory activities, grouped by the categories of inservice, teacher evaluation, curriculum improvement and instructional supervision services. The results of their responses are reported in Table 11.

More teachers and other respondent groups agreed that they participated in one day workshops, one day programs, workshops and demonstrations lasting more

Table 10

Medium-Size City

Characteristics of Respondents

Characteristics	Category									
	N=386 Teachers		N=17 Teachers' Associations Officers		N=46 Principals		N=35 Supervisors		N=5 Superintendents	
Numbers of Years in Position	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
5-10	117	30.3	6	35.3	25	54.3	15	42.9		
11-15	123	31.9	3	17.6	11	23.9	5	14.3	2	40.0
16+	142	36.8	8	47.1	9	19.6	8	22.9	3	60.0
No Response	4	1.0			1	2.2	7	20.0		
Current School Level (Highest Level)										
Early Childhood	16	4.1					1	2.9		
Primary	57	14.8			1	2.2				
Upper Elementary	97	25.1	5	29.4	19	41.3	1	2.9		
Middle School	44	11.4	1	5.9	5	10.9	2	5.7		
Junior High	54	14.0	4	23.5	7	15.2	1	2.9		
Senior High	110	25.5	3	17.6	11	23.9	17	48.6	5	100.0
Other	8	2.1	4	23.5	2	4.3	13	37.1		
No Response					1	2.2				
Highest Degree Held										
Bachelor's	185	47.9	2	11.8			2	5.7		
Master's	127	32.9	8	47.1	10	21.7	15	42.9		
Master's + 30 s.h.	71	18.4	6	35.3	31	67.4	14	40.0	2	40.0
Doctorate	3	0.8	1	5.9	4	8.7	3	8.6	3	60.0
No Response					1	2.2	1	2.9		

Table 11

Medium-Size City

Perceptions of Activities Involved in/Available During the Previous Three Years by Category of Respondent

Activity	Category									
	N=386 Teachers		N=17 Teachers' Association Officers		N= 46 Principals		N= 35 Supervisors		N=5 Superintendents	
In-service activity	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
One day demos, workshops conducted by public school personnel										
Yes	313	81.1	15	88.2	39	84.8	33	94.3	5	100.0
No	73	18.9	2	11.8	7	15.2	2	5.7		
Presentations by educational sales representatives										
Yes	186	48.2	7	41.2	16	34.8	27	77.1	4	80.0
No	199	51.6	10	58.8	30	65.2	8	22.9	1	20.0
One day programs by outside consultant										
Yes	241	62.4	12	70.6	35	76.1	33	94.3	3	60.0
No	145	37.6	5	29.4	11	23.9	2	5.7	2	40.0
In-classroom assistance in innovative teaching/ using new materials										
Yes	102	26.4	7	41.2	22	47.8	20	57.1	3	60.0
No	284	73.6	10	58.8	24	52.2	15	42.9	2	40.0

Table 11 (continued)

Observations of other teachers										
Yes	105	27.2	6	35.3	39	84.8	29	82.9	4	80.0
No	281	72.8	11	64.7	7	15.2	6	17.1	1	20.0
Special college courses conducted at a local school by a college staff member										
Yes	138	35.8	5	29.4	20	43.5	19	54.3	3	60.0
No	248	64.2	12	70.6	26	56.5	16	45.7	2	40.0
Workshops, demos lasting more than one day and conducted by local or outside consultants										
Yes	198	51.3	10	58.8	41	89.1	29	82.9	5	100.0
No	188	48.7	7	41.2	5	10.9	6	17.1		
Independent projects which are a part of a formal inservice program										
Yes	95	24.6	2	11.8	20	43.5	22	62.9	3	60.0
No	291	75.4	15	88.2	26	56.5	13	37.1	2	40.0
Other										
Yes	40	10.4			6	13.0	5	14.3		
No	346	89.6	17	100.0	40	87.0	30	85.7	5	100.0
Teacher evaluation										
Evaluation by superior										
Yes	367	95.1	16	94.1	45	97.8	17	48.6	4	80.0
No	19	4.9	1	5.9	1	2.2	18	51.4	1	20.0

Table 11 (continued)

Peer evaluation										
Yes	63	16.3	3	17.6	7	15.2	7	20.0		
No	323	83.7	14	82.4	39	84.8	28	80.0	5	100.0
Self evaluation										
Yes	243	63.0	6	35.3	23	50.0	15	42.9	4	80.0
No	143	37.0	11	64.7	23	50.0	20	57.1	1	20.0
Evaluation by pupils										
Yes	110	28.5	6	35.3	6	13.0	3	8.6	1	20.0
No	276	71.5	11	64.7	40	87.0	32	91.4	4	80.0
Evaluation of classroom climate (as opposed to evaluation of the teacher)										
Yes	71	18.4	6	35.3	24	52.2	11	31.4	1	20.0
No	315	81.6	11	64.7	22	47.8	24	68.6	4	80.0
Other										
Yes	27	7.0	2	11.8	7	15.2	11	31.4	1	20.0
No	359	93.0	15	88.2	39	84.8	24	68.6	4	80.0
Curriculum improvement										
Developing new courses										
Yes	120	31.1	5	29.4	26	56.5	20	57.1	5	100.0
No	266	68.9	12	70.6	20	43.5	15	42.9		
Writing competency criteria tests										
Yes	64	16.9	5	29.4	7	15.2	9	25.7	4	80.0
No	321	83.2	12	70.6	39	84.8	26	74.3	1	20.0

Table 11 (continued)

Adapting a curriculum to new materials, text, or approaches										
Yes	221	57.3	11	64.7	35	75.1	19	54.3	5	100.0
No	165	42.7	6	35.3	11	23.9	16	45.7		
Developing new curriculum guides										
Yes	149	38.6	5	29.4	15	32.6	29	82.9	5	100.0
No	237	61.4	12	76.6	31	67.4	6	17.1		
Selecting a new curriculum program										
Yes	108	28.0	7	41.2	24	52.2	18	51.4	1	20.0
No	278	72.0	10	58.8	22	47.8	17	48.6	4	80.0
Other										
Yes	39	10.1	1	5.9	9	19.6	8	22.9	2	40.0
No	347	89.9	16	94.1	37	80.4	27	77.1	3	60.0
Instructional supervision services										
Clinical supervision (pre-conference observation, follow-up conference										
Yes	94	24.4	5	29.4	33	71.7	13	37.1	3	60.0
No	292	75.6	12	70.6	13	28.3	22	62.9	2	40.0
Observation followed by a conference										
Yes	237	61.4	11	64.7	46	100.0	25	71.4	5	100.0
No	149	38.6	6	35.3			10	28.6		

Table 11 (continued)

Supplementary materials based on a knowledge of your goals, and problems										
Yes	133	34.5	3	17.6	36	78.3	30	85.7	4	80.0
No	253	65.5	14	82.4	10	21.7	7	14.3	1	20.0
Audio-Visual										
Yes	118	30.6	2	11.8	20	43.5	25	71.4	3	60.0
No	268	69.4	15	88.2	26	56.5	10	28.6	2	40.0
Changes in teaching procedures, approaches										
Yes	110	28.5	3	17.6	39	84.8	23	65.7	4	80.0
No	276	71.5	14	82.4	7	15.2	12	34.3	1	20.0
Reinforcement for teaching procedures, & approaches										
Yes	133	34.5	6	35.3	34	73.9	24	68.6	3	60.0
No	253	65.5	11	64.7	12	26.1	11	31.4	2	40.0
Other										
Yes	25	6.5			3	6.5	1	2.9	1	20.0
No	361	93.5	17	100.0	43	93.5	34	97.1	4	80.0

than one day than other choices. A higher percentage of supervisors reported involvement in more activities than any other group, ranging from 94.3% to 54.3%. A major discrepancy was on an item in which supervisors (57.1%) and principals (47.8%) reported giving in-classroom assistance; whereas relatively few teachers (26.4%) reported receiving it. An additional discrepancy involved far fewer teachers (24.6%) reporting inservice on an independent project basis than supervisors (62.9%) and principals (43.5%). The item on observations was apparently misinterpreted by supervisors and principals and is considered invalid information for this study.

All groups agreed that the predominant teacher evaluation procedure is that by a superior. Areas of discrepancy in responses included self observation where considerably more teachers (63%) and superintendents (80.0%) reported such involvement than did supervisors (42.9%) or principals (50.0%). A modest number of teachers reported pupil evaluations (28.5%), and principals (13.0%), supervisors (8.6%) and superintendents (20.0%) reported minimal amounts.

Only one aspect of curriculum improvement was reported as an area of high activity for all groups - adapting a curriculum to a new text or materials. As a group, a higher percentage of supervisors reported themselves as involved in various curriculum improvement efforts than any other group, including principals. Superintendents generally reported their districts as being involved in all of the curriculum improvement efforts with the exception of selecting new curriculum programs. This contrasted with a large percentage of supervisors (51.4%) and principals (52.2%) reporting themselves involved in selecting new curriculum programs.

A high percentage of all groups agreed that they had participated in the instructional supervisory service of observations followed by a conference (teachers, 61.4%; association officers, 64.7%; principals, 100%; supervisors 71.4%; superintendents, 100.%). Only one group, principals, reported a high percentage of involvement (71.7%) in clinical supervison; by contrast only a modest percentage of teachers (24.4%) reported such involvement. A high percentage of supervisors (37.1% - 85.7%) and principals (43.5% - 100%) reported involvement in virtually all of the instructional supervisory services; whereas only a modest percentage of teachers (24.4% - 61.4%), the recipients of these services, reported such involvement.

Factors that Have Been the Focus of Instructional Improvement Efforts.

Specific factors that have been the focus of instructional improvement as indicated by a high percentage of involvement by all respondents included high expectations of pupils, teacher enthusiasm, individualizing instruction, classroom climate, and an emphasis on pupil activities (Table 12). These factors have all been associated with high pupil achievement. Other factors associated with high pupil achievement such as abundance of materials in the classroom and task orientation, received lower, but still substantial support by all groups as being a focus for instructional improvement efforts. Two factors less associated with pupil learning, bulletin boards and use of audio-visual materials, received lower support by all groups, indicating these are less of a focus.

Extent to Which Teachers' Needs Are Being Met by Supervisory Services.

All respondents' perceptions of the extent to which teachers' needs are being met currently and compared to five years ago are displayed in Tables 13 and 14. By comparing responses of 1 and 2 with 4 and 5 some generalizations may be drawn about trends and these comparisons are presented in Table 15.

Table 12

Medium-Size City

Perception of Focus of Instructional Improvement Efforts by Principals, Supervisors, or Others by Category of Respondents

Focus	Category									
	N=386 Teachers		N=17 Teachers' Association Officers		N=46 Principals		N=35 Supervisors		N=5 Superintendents	
High expectations of pupils by teachers	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	258	66.8	9	52.9	33	71.7	20	57.1	4	80.0
No	124	32.1	8	47.1	10	21.7	15	42.9	1	20.0
No Response	4	1.1			3	6.5				
Teacher enthusiasm										
Yes	245	63.5	10	58.8	36	78.3	22	62.9	5	100.0
No	136	35.2	7	41.2	8	17.4	13	37.1		
No Response	5	1.3			2	4.3				
Instruction in the use of audio-visual materials, equipment										
Yes	155	40.2	7	41.2	18	39.1	18	51.4	2	40.0
No	228	59.1	10	58.8	26	56.5	17	48.6	3	60.0
No Response	3	0.8			2	4.3				
Emphasis on task orientation by teacher										
Yes	194	50.3	8	47.1	27	58.7	27	77.1	4	80.0
No	188	48.7	9	52.90	17	37.0	8	22.9	1	20.0
No Response	4	1.0			2	4.3				

Table 12 (continued)

Individualizing instruction										
Yes	273	70.7	12	70.6	37	80.4	31	88.6	5	100.0
No	109	28.2	5	29.4	6	13.0	4	11.4		
No Response	4	1.1			3	6.5				
Classroom climate of warmth, support, mutual respect										
Yes	283	73.3	15	88.2	41	89.1	32	91.4	3	60.0
No	99	25.6	2	11.8	3	6.5	3	8.6	2	40.0
No Response	4	1.1			2	4.3				
Abundance of materials in classrooms available for use by teachers and pupils										
Yes	185	47.9	8	47.1	31	67.4	19	54.3	4	80.0
No	197	51.0	9	52.9	13	28.3	16	45.7	1	20.0
No Response	4	1.1			2	4.3				
Emphasis on pupil activities in classroom vs. pupil passivity										
Yes	269	69.7	10	58.8	32	69.6	28	80.0	5	100.0
No	113	29.3	7	41.2	10	21.7	7	20.0		
No Response	4	1.0			4	8.7				
The making and use of bulletin boards										
Yes	108	28.0	7	41.2	12	26.1	12	34.3		
No	271	70.2	10	58.8	32	69.6	23	65.7	5	100.0
No Response	7	1.8			2	4.3				

Table 13

Medium-Size City

Perception of Extent to Which Teachers' Needs are Currently Met by Supervisory Services by Category of Respondents

Service		Category									
		N=386 Teachers		N=17 Teachers' Association Officers		N=46 Principals		N=35 Supervisors		N=5 Superintendents	
In-Service		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Low	1	88	22.8	7	41.2	1	2.2	2	5.7	1	20.0
	2	80	20.7	3	17.6	11	23.9	2	5.7		
	3	137	35.5	5	29.4	12	26.1	13	37.1	2	40.0
	4	59	15.3 21	1	5.9	17	37.0	15	42.9	2	40.0
High	5	21	5.4	1	5.9	3	6.5	3	8.6		
							43.5		52.5		
No Response	6	1	0.3			2	4.3				
Teacher Evaluation											
Low	1	52	13.5	9	52.9	3	6.5	3	8.6		
	2	59	15.3	3	17.6	14	30.4	7	20.0	1	20.0
	3	134	34.7	5	29.4	12	26.1	13	37.1	2	40.0
	4	97	25.1			15	32.6	9	25.7	2	40.0
High	5	39	10.1			1	2.2	1	2.9		
									29		
No Response	6	5	1.3			1	2.2	2	5.7		
Curriculum Improvement											
Low	1	58	15.0	6	35.3	1	2.2	2	5.7		
	2	74	19.2	5	29.4	9	19.6	2	5.7		
	3	122	31.6	2	11.8	19	41.3	15	42.9	2	40.0
	4	101	26.2	4	23.5	14	30.4	13	37.1	3	60.0
High	5	25	6.5			2	4.3	3	8.6		
							[illegible]		[illegible]		
No Response	6	6	1.6			1	2.2				

Table 13 (continued)

Instructional Supervision Services							Principals		Superv.		
Low	1	68	17.6	5	29.4	2	4.3	2	5.7		
	2	62	16.1	7	41.2	11	23.9	1	2.9	1	20.0
	3	140	36.3	3	17.6	17	37.0	15	42.9	2	40.0
	4	85	22.0	2	11.8	11	23.9	14	40.0	2	40.0
High	5	23	6.0			2	4.3	2	5.7		
No Response	6	8	2.1			3	6.5	1	2.9		
All Supervisory Services Considered as a Whole											
Poor	1	39	10.1	4	23.5			2	5.7		
	2	80	20.7	5	29.4	11	23.9	7	20.0	3	60.0
	3	134	34.7	6	35.3	20	43.5	13	37.1	2	40.0
	4	89	23.1	2	11.8	11	23.9	11	31.4		
Excellent	5	37	9.6			3	6.5	2	5.7		
No Response	6	7	1.8			1	2.2				

Table 14
Medium Size City

Perceptions of the Extent to Which Teachers' Needs are Met by Supervisory Services Compared to Five Years Ago by Category of Respondents

Service		Category									
		N=386 Teachers		N=17 Teachers' Association Officers		N=46 Principals		N=35 Supervisors		N=5 Superintendents	
		Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
In-Service											
Low	1	61	15.8	5	29.4	2	43.0	2	5.7		
	2	74	19.2	2	11.8	6	13.0	4	11.4	1	20.0
	3	121	31.3	6	35.3	11	23.9	5	14.3	1	20.0
	4	80	20.7	2	11.8	20	43.5	14	40.0	3	60.0
High	5	25	6.5	2	11.8	5	10.9	7	20.0		
No Response		25	6.5			2	4.3	3	8.6		
Teacher Eval.											
Low	1	34	8.8	5	29.4	2	4.3	4	11.4		
	2	59	15.3	4	23.5	6	13.0	3	8.6	1	20.0
	3	143	37.0	5	29.4	13	28.3	10	28.6	1	20.0
	4	96	24.9	3	17.6	19	41.3	11	31.4	2	40.0
High	5	31	8.0			4	8.7	3	8.6	1	20.0
No Response		23	6.0			2	4.3	4	11.4		
Curriculum Improvement											
Low	1	36	9.3	2	11.8	1	2.2	2	5.7		
	2	57	14.8	6	35.3	7	15.2	3	8.6		
	3	132	34.2	4	23.5	15	32.6	7	20.0	1	20.0
	4	107	27.7	4	23.5	17	37.0	17	48.6	3	60.0
High	5	31	8.0	1	5.9	4	8.7	5	14.3	1	20.0
No Response		23	6.0			2	4.3				
Instructional Supervision Services											
Low	1	40	10.4	2	11.8	2	4.3	2	5.7		
	2	63	16.3	5	29.4	8	17.4	5	14.3	1	20.0
	3	137	35.5	7	41.2	17	37.0	6	17.1	2	40.0
	4	89	23.1	2	11.8	13	28.3	15	42.9	2	40.0
High	5	30	7.8			3	6.5	4	11.4		
No Response		27	7.0	1	5.9	3	6.5	3	8.6		
All Supervisory Ser. Considered As a Whole											
Poorer	1	21	5.4	4	23.5			3	8.6		
	2	53	13.7	4	23.5	11	23.9	2	5.7	2	40.0
	3	156	40.4	4	23.5	15	32.6	5	14.3	2	40.0
	4	91	23.6	5	29.4	12	26.1	18	51.4		
Better	5	39	10.1			6	13.0	4	11.4	1	20.0
No Response		26	6.7			2	4.3	3	8.6		

Table 15
Medium City

Perceptions of the Extent to Which Teachers' Needs are Met by Supervisory Services Compared to Five Years Ago by Category of Respondents

Service		Category									
		N=386 Teachers		N=17 Teachers' Association Officers		N=46 Principals		N=35 Supervisors		N=5 Superintendents	
		Now	5 yrs. Ago	Now	5 yrs. Ago	Now	5 yrs. Ago	Now	5 yrs. Ago	Now	5 yrs. Ago
In-Service											
Low	1 2	43.5	35.0	58.8	41.2	26.1	56.0	11.4	17.1	20.0	20.0
	3										
High	4 5	20.7	27.2	11.8	23.6	43.5	54.4	51.5	60.0	40.0	60.0
No Response											
Teacher Eval.											
Low	1 2	28.8	24.1	70.5	52.9	36.9	17.3	28.6	20.0	20.0	20.0
	3										
High	4 5	35.2	39.9	----	17.6	34.8	50.0	28.6	40.0	40.0	60.0
No Response											
Curriculum Improvement											
Low	1 2	34.2	24.1	64.7	47.1	21.8	17.4	11.4	14.3	----	----
	3										
High	4 5	32.7	35.7	35.3	29.4	34.7	45.7	45.7	62.9	60.0	80.0
No Response											
Instructional Supervision Services											
Low	1 2	33.7	26.7	70.6	41.2	28.2	21.7	8.6	20.0	20.0	20.0
	3										
High	4 5	28.0	30.9	11.8	11.8	28.2	34.8	45.7	54.3	40.0	40.0
No Response											
All Supervisory Ser. Considered As a Whole											
Poorer	1 2	30.8	18.2	52.9	47.0	23.9	23.9	25.7	14.3	60.0	40.0
	3										
Better	4 5	32.7	33.7	11.8	29.4	30.4	39.1	37.1	62.8	----	20.0
No Response											

Teachers' association officers have the dimmest view of the adequacy of supervisory services by far, followed by teachers whose responses generally are equally balanced between low and high scores. Supervisors, principals and superintendents hold more positive views, both currently and as compared with five years ago. A wide disparity was noted between teacher estimates of the adequacy of inservice and those of supervisors and principals in particular. Indeed, as a general observation teachers differed more widely from supervisors in their views of the adequacy of supervisory services than with any other group, with the posible exception of superintendents.

Responsibility for Various Supervisory Functions by Level of School Organization.

As show in Table 16, all respondents seemed to be in fairly close agreement concerning the level of responsibility of the central office for various supervisory services with two noteable exceptions; superintendents (60%), more than other groups tended to see staff development as solely a central office function; supervisors(57.1%) more than other groups tended to see curriculum improvement projects as solely a central office function.

Greater consensus was found among respondent groups with respect to responsibilities of the decentralized office (Table 17) where this organizational entity existed. Only supervisorsdisagreed with other respondents with respect to responsibility for teacher evaluation where supervisorstended to see this as a shared function (34.3%) and principals (32.6%) among others tended to see limited or no responsibility for the decentralized office.

Strong agreement was revealed in Table 18 by all respondents in assigning primary or sole responsibility for teacher evaluation to the building principal. In addition, strong agreement was revealed that staff development and curriculum improvement were shared responsibilities between the building principal and

Table 16
Medium City

Perceived Amount of Responsibility Assumed for Various Supervisory Functions by Level School Organization by Category of Respondents

Central Office

Service	Category									
	N= 386 Teachers Number	%	N= 17 Teachers' Association Officers Number	%	N= 46 Principals Number	%	N=35 Supervisors Number	%	N= 5 Superintendents Number	%
Staff Dev.										
1	83	21.5	9	52.9	7	15.2	9	25.7	3	60.0
2	209	54.1	4	23.5	35	76.1	23	65.7	2	40.0
3	55	14.2	3	17.6	1	2.2	2	5.7		
4	1	.3								
No Response	38	9.8	1	5.9	3	6.5	1	2.9		
Teacher Eval.										
1	7	1.8	3	17.6	1	2.2	3	8.6		
2	96	24.9	5	29.4	10	21.7	10	28.6	1	20.0
3	193	50.0	7	41.2	25	54.3	19	54.3	4	80.0
4	6	1.6			2	4.3	1	2.9		
No Response	84	21.8	2	11.8	8	17.4	2	5.7		
Curriculum Improvement Projects										
1	106	27.5	6	35.3	10	21.7	20	57.1	2	40.0
2	192	49.7	9	52.9	31	67.4	14	40.0	3	60.0
3	44	11.4	2	11.8	2	4.3	1	2.9		
4	1	.3								
No Response	43	11.1			3	6.5				
Instructional Supervision										
1	34	8.8	5	29.4	3	6.5	10	28.6	1	20.0
2	183	47.4	6	35.3	17	37.0	15	42.9	4	80.0
3	104	26.9	5	29.4	16	34.8	8	22.9		
4	4	1.0			1	2.2				
No Response	61	15.8	1	5.9	9	19.6	2	5.7		

1=Primary or sole responsibility
2=Shared responsibility
3=Limited or no responsibility
4=Not applicable

Table 17
Medium City

Perceived Amount of Responsibility Assumed for Various Supervisory Functions by Level School Organization by Category of Respondents

Decentralized Office

Service	Category									
	N= 386 Teachers Number	%	N= 17 Teachers' Association Officers Number	%	N=46 Principals Number	%	N=35 Supervisors Number	%	N= 5 Superintendents Number	%
Staff Dev.										
1	11	2.8	2	11.8	1	2.2	3	8.6	1	
2	107	27.7	6	35.3	19	41.3	11	31.4	1	20.0
3	55	14.2	1	5.9	6	13.0	1	2.9	1	20.0
4	100	25.9	6	35.3	13	28.3	10	28.6	2	20.0
No Response	113	29.3	2	11.8	7	15.2	10	28.6		40.0
Teacher Eval.										
1	4	1.0	1	5.9	1	2.2			1	20.0
2	59	15.3	3	17.6	5	10.9	12	34.3	1	20.0
3	91	23.6	4	23.5	15	32.6	2	5.7	1	20.0
4	106	27.5	6	35.3	12	26.1	10	28.6		
No Response	126	32.6	3	17.6	13	28.3	11	31.4	2	40.0
Curriculum Improvement Projects										
1	20	5.2	1	5.9	3	6.5	2	5.7		
2	119	30.8	8	47.1	16	34.8	8	22.9	1	20.0
3	43	11.1	2	11.8	7	15.2	5	14.3	1	20.0
4	94	24.4	5	29.4	12	26.1	10	28.6	1	20.0
No Response	110	28.5	1	5.9	8	17.4	10	28.6	2	40.0
Instructional Supervision										
1	9	2.3	1	5.9	2	4.3	3	8.6	1	20.0
2	103	26.7	10	58.8	13	28.3	9	25.7	1	20.0
3	58	15.0	1	5.9	8	17.4	3	8.6		
4	102	26.4	5	29.4	12	26.1	10	28.6	1	20.0
No Response	114	29.5			11	23.9	10	28.6	2	40.0

1=Primary or sole responsibility
2=Shared responsibility
3=Limited or no responsibility
4=Not applicable

Table 18
Medium City

Perceived Amount of Responsibility Assumed for Various Supervisory Functions by Level School Organization by Category of Respondents

Building Principal

Service	Teachers N= 386 Number	Teachers %	Teachers' Association Officers N= 17 Number	Teachers' Association Officers %	Principals N=46 Number	Principals %	Supervisors N=35 Number	Supervisors %	Superintendents N= 5 Number	Superintendents %
Staff Dev.										
1	77	19.9	5	29.4	7	15.2	7	20.0		
2	214	55.4	8	47.1	34	73.9	22	62.9	5	100.0
3	47	12.2	3	17.6	4	8.7	3	8.6		
4	2	.5								
No Response	46	11.9	1	5.9	1	2.2	3	8.6		
Teacher Eval.										
1	275	71.2	15	88.2	39	84.8	28	80.0	5	100.0
2	78	20.2			5	10.9	5	14.3		
3	8	2.1	1	5.9	1	2.2				
4										
No Response	25	6.5	1	5.9	1	2.2	2	5.7		
Curriculum Improvement Projects										
1	34	8.8	5	29.4	3	6.5	6	17.1		
2	220	57.0	10	58.8	34	73.9	17	48.6	4	80.0
3	71	18.4			5	10.9	5	14.3	1	20.0
4	3	.8	1	5.9						
No Response	58	15.0	1	5.9	4	8.7	7	20.0		
Instructional Supervision										
1	157	40.7	6	35.3	30	65.2	12	34.3	3	60.0
2	163	42.2	6	35.3	13	28.3	17	48.6	2	40.0
3	28	7.3	2	11.8	2	4.3	4	11.4		
4			1	5.9						
No Response	38	9.8	2	11.8	1	2.2	2	5.7		

1=Primary or sole responsibility
2=Shared responsibility
3=Limited or no responsibility
4=Not applicable

other organizational levels. More ambivalence was found regarding the responsibility for instructional supervision with teachers, officers of teachers' associations, supervisors and superintendents dividing almost equally between sole responsibility and shared responsibility. Principals (65.2%) alone, tended to feel more strongly that this was a building principal function.

Analysis of Quantitative Data

Suburban

Characteristics of Respondents.

Perhaps the most noteworthy of the characteristics of the respondents was their relatively short tenure in their positions (Table 19). This is true for all categories of respondents, teachers through superintendents. This may be explained by the fact that two of three suburban districts have experienced rapid growth in the past five years. Of particular interest was the finding that 87.5% of the supervisors had been in their positions less than ten years.

With respect to grade level, secondary school teachers composed 61.6% of the respondents, a larger group than would normally be expected; this observation was true for teachers' association officers and principals as well. Supervisors were evenly balanced between elementary and secondary.

All groups had high percentages of upper level degrees with teachers recording 69.7%; teachers' association officers, 87.5%; supervisors, 95.8% and all princiapals and superintendents at the upper degree levels. Further, 26.3% of the princiapals reported having their doctorate. In summary, the respondents from suburban schools may be profiled as relatively young, overly representative of secondary level and highly educated.

Supervisory Services.

The first issue addressed by the study was the current state of supervisory services - what specific types of supervisory services are teachers receiving?

Table 19

Suburban

Characteristics of Respondents

Characteristics	Category N=112 Teachers		N=8 Teachers' Association Officers		N=24 Supervisors		N=19 Principals		N=2 Superintendents	
Numbers of Years in Position	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
5-10	46	41.1	4	50.0	21	87.5	9	47.4	1	50.0
11-15	24	21.4	2	25.0	2	8.3	6	31.6		
16+	42	37.5	2	25.0	1	4.2	4	21.1	1	50.0
Current School Level (Highest Level)										
Early Childhood	1	.9			1	4.2				
Primary	16	14.3			2	8.3				
Upper Elementary	24	21.4	2	25.0	9	37.5	7	36.8		
Middle School	28	25.0	1	12.5	3	12.5	2	10.5		
Junior High	11	9.8	2	25.0			4	21.1		
Senior High	30	26.8	2	25.0	9	37.5	4	21.1		
Other	2	1.8	1	12.5			2	10.5		
Highest Degree Held										
Bachelor's	34	30.4	1	12.5	1	4.2				
Master's	45	40.2	4	50.0	9	37.5	8	42.1		
Master's + 30 s.h.	32	28.6	3	37.5	12	50.0	6	31.6		
Doctorate	1	.9			2	8.3	5	26.3	2	100.0

Table 20 summarizes responses to the four supervisory services covered by this study - inservice, evaluation, curriculum improvement and instructional supervision services - by category of respondents.

By far teachers reported one day workshops and one day programs by outside experts as the most frequent inservice activity. All other categories of respondents also gave high ranking to these activities. The only other activity reported frequently by teachers were workshops lasting more than one day, which again was confirmed by all other groups. The high level of teacher observations reported by supervisors and principals was apparently a result of misinterpretation of the item. It was intended to convey peer observations by teachers on each other, rather than by supervisors as it was presumably interpreted by supervisors and principals. The highest level of discrepancy between groups was recorded for the item "In-classroom assistance in adapting an innovative practice or using new materials." Supervisors reported this three times more than teachers reported receiving it. Principals also reported a high level of this item. Another item of high discrepancy was for "Independent projects which are part of a formal inservice program." In response to this item, only 33.9% of the teachers saw themselves so involved in the past three years; whereas 50% of the supervisors and 57.9% of the principals reported themselves so involved with teachers.

The predominant method of teacher evaluation continues to be evaluation by superiors as reported by four of the five categories of respondents. The only other method of evaluation used at all frequently is that of self evaluation. The major discrepancy between groups was found for the item on evaluating classroom climate (as opposed to evaluation of the teacher) where only 18.8% of the teachers reported this contrasted with 41.7% of the supervisors and 68.4% of

Table 20

Suburban

Perceptions of Activities Involved in/Available During the Previous Three Years by Category of Respondent

Activity	Category									
	N=112 Teachers		N=8 Teachers' Association Officers		N=24 Supervisors		N=19 Principals		N=2 Superintendents	
In-service activity	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
One day demos, workshops conducted by public school personnel										
Yes	80	71.4	6	75.0	19	79.2	18	94.7	2	100.0
No	32	28.6	2	25.0	5	20.8	1	5.3		
Presentations by educational sales representatives										
Yes	50	44.6	4	50.0	18	75.0	7	36.8	2	100.0
No	62	55.4	4	50.0	6	25.0	12	63.2		
One day programs by outside consultant										
Yes	74	66.1	7	87.5	20	83.3	17	89.5	2	100.0
No	38	33.9	1	12.5	4	16.7	2	10.5		
In-classroom assistance in innovative teaching/using new materials										
Yes	21	18.8	3	37.5	15	62.5	10	52.6	2	100.0
No	91	81.3	5	62.5	9	37.5	9	47.4		

Table 20 (continued)

Observations of other teachers										
Yes	35	31.3	4	50.0	22	91.7	15	78.9	1	50.0
No	77	68.8	4	50.0	2	8.3	4	21.1	1	50.0
Special college courses conducted at a local school by a college staff member										
Yes	55	49.1	4	50.0	8	33.3	7	36.8	1	50.0
No	57	50.9	4	50.0	16	66.7	12	63.2	1	50.0
Workshops, demos lasting more than one day and conducted by local or outside consultants										
Yes	62	55.4	7	87.5	14	58.3	13	68.4	2	100.0
No	50	44.6	1	12.5	10	41.7	6	31.6		
Independent projects which are a part of a formal inservice program										
Yes	38	33.9	4	50.0	12	50.0	11	57.9	1	50.0
No	74	66.1	4	50.0	12	50.0	8	42.1	1	50.0
Other										
Yes	8	7.1	2	25.0	2	8.3	3	15.8	1	50.0
No	104	92.9	6	75.0	22	91.7	16	84.2	1	50.0

Table 20 (continued)

Teacher evaluation										
Evaluation by superior										
Yes	105	93.8	7	87.5	11	45.8	19	100.0	2	100.0
No	7	6.3	1	12.5	13	54.2				
Peer evaluation										
Yes	25	22.3	1	12.5	6	25.0	4	21.1	1	50.0
No	87	77.7	7	87.5	18	75.0	15	78.9	1	50.0
Self evaluation										
Yes	74	66.1	5	62.5	12	50.0	13	68.4	1	50.0
No	38	33.9	3	37.5	12	50.0	6	31.6	1	50.0
Evaluation by pupils										
Yes	39	34.8	3	37.5	8	33.3	4	21.1	1	50.0
No	73	65.2	5	62.5	16	66.7	15	78.9	1	50.0
Evaluation of classroom climate (as opposed to evaluation of the teacher)										
Yes	21	18.8	2	25.0	10	41.7	13	68.4	1	50.0
No	91	81.3	6	75.0	14	58.3	6	31.6	1	50.0
Other										
Yes	3	2.7	1	12.5	5	20.8	5	26.3	1	50.0
No	109	97.3	7	87.5	19	79.2	14	73.7	1	50.0

Table 20 (continued)

Curriculum improvement										
Developing new courses										
Yes	46	41.1	5	62.5	15	62.5	16	84.2	2	100.0
No	66	58.9	3	37.5	9	37.5	3	15.8		
Writing competency criteria tests										
Yes	25	22.3	1	12.5	2	8.3	3	15.8	1	50.0
No	87	77.7	7	87.5	22	91.7	16	84.2	1	50.0
Adapting a curriculum to new materials, text, or approaches										
Yes	70	62.5	6	75.0	19	79.2	12	63.2	2	100.0
No	42	37.5	2	25.0	5	20.8	7	36.8		
Developing new curriculum guides										
Yes	54	48.2	6	75.0	18	75.0	10	52.6	2	100.0
No	58	51.8	2	25.0	6	25.0	9	47.4		
Selecting a new curriculum program										
Yes	30	26.8	4	50.0	10	41.7	14	73.7	2	100.0
No	82	73.2	4	50.0	14	58.3	5	26.3		
Other										
Yes	10	8.9	1	12.5	1	4.2	5	26.3	1	50.0
No	102	91.1	7	87.5	23	95.8	14	73.7	1	50.0

Table 20 (continued)

Instructional supervision services										
Clinical supervision (pre-conference observation, follow-up conference										
Yes	20	17.9	1	12.5	7	29.2	13	68.4	1	50.0
No	92	82.1	7	87.5	17	70.8	6	31.6	1	50.0
Observation followed by a conference										
Yes	65	58.0	4	50.0	18	75.0	18	94.7	2	100.0
No	47	42.0	4	50.0	6	25.0	1	5.3		
Supplementary materials based on a knowledge of your goals, and problems										
Yes	46	41.1	2	25.0	20	83.3	17	89.5	2	100.0
No	66	58.9	6	75.0	4	16.7	2	10.5		
Audio-Visual										
Yes	30	26.8	2	25.0	15	62.5	8	42.1	2	100.0
No	82	73.2	6	75.0	9	37.5	11	57.9		
Changes in teaching procedures, approaches										
Yes	29	25.9	3	37.5	21	87.5	16	84.2	2	100.0
No	83	74.1	5	62.5	3	12.5	3	15.8		

Table 20 (continued)

Reinforcement for teaching procedures, & approaches										
Yes	46	41.1	5	62.5	18	75.0	16	84.2	2	100.0
No	66	58.9	3	37.5	6	25.0	3	15.8		
Other										
Yes	1	.9			2	8.3	2	10.5	1	50.0
No	111	99.1	8	100.0	22	91.7	17	89.5	1	50.0

the principals.

Teachers reported high levels of activity in adapting a curriculum to new materials, text or approaches (62.5%). Developing new courses (41.1%) and new curriculum guides (48.2%) were also reported as levels of high activity; other respondents tended to confirm the teachers' views. The only area of discrepancy was that principals, supervisors, officers of teachers' associations and superintendents tended to see themselves more involved in selection of new curriculum programs than teachers reported themselves involved.

In the area of instructional supervisory services almost all categories of resondents agreed that observations followed by conferences, suggesting supplementary materials and reinforcing appropriate teacher behaviors were frequent services teachers receive. Several discrepancies were noted between groups, however. For example within the agreements noted above, almost twice the percentage of principals and supervisors reported giving these services as teachers reported receiving them. Three times the number of pricipals as teachers reported clinical supervision services and over twice as many supervisors and principals reported recommending audio-visuals and recommending changes as teachers reported receiving such services.

In summary, all categories generally agree that inservice frequently consists of one-day workshops and programs and workshops lasting more than one day; evaluation is most frequently conducted by superiors and self; curriculum improvement was characterized by all groups as curriculum adaptation, developing new courses and new guides; instructional supervisory services most often consisted of observations followed by a conference, suggesting supplementary materials and reinforcing appropriate teacher behavior. Discrepancies between groups for inservice were on providng in-classroom assistance and independent projects; for evaluation, on classroom climate; for curriculum development, on selection of new curriculum programs; and for instructional supervisory services, on clinical supervision, recommending audio-visuals and recommending changes. In each case, substantially fewer teachers reported involvement than supervisors and principals reported for themselves.

Factors that Have Been the Focus of Instructional Improvement Efforts.

Table 21 shows the results of the survey with respect to certain potential focuses of instructional improvement efforts. Interestingly, teachers, supervisors, principals and superintendents were in fairly close agreement on the emphasis placed on various factors; only the officers of the teachers' associations revealed marked differences from the teachers -- on use of audio-visual materials and emphasis on task orientation. All of the factors, except use of audio-visual materials (some would question this) and use of bulletin boards, have been associated with effective instruction and it appears that these factors are receiving a substantial amount of emphasis in the supervisory program in the suburban schools included in this study.

Extent to Which Teachers' Needs are Being Met by Supervisory Services.

A major interest in this study was to assess how well teacher needs were being currently met by supervisory services and also how they were being met compared to five years ago. The results of these inquiries are reported in Tables 22 and 23. By omitting the middle score of 3 and comparing scores 1 and 2 against scores 4 and 5 (Table 24), a pattern can be ascertained. Fewer than half the teachers report that their needs are currently met to a high degree (4 or 5) and this view is shared by all other categories of respondents. Officers of teachers' associations tend to hold the darkest view of supervisory services,

Table 21

Suburban

Perception of Focus of Instructional Improvement Efforts by Principals, Supervisors, or Others by Category of Respondents

Focus	Category N=112 Teachers		N=8 Teachers' Association Officers		N=24 Supervisors		N=19 Principals		N=2 Superintendents	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
High expectations of pupils by teachers										
Yes	68	60.7	6	75.0	16	66.7	14	73.7	1	50.0
No	42	37.5	2	25.0	8	33.3	5	26.3	1	50.0
No Response	2	1.8								
Teacher enthusiasm										
Yes	79	70.5	5	62.5	16	66.7	18	94.7	2	100.0
No	31	27.7	3	37.5	8	33.3	1	5.3		
No Response	2	1.8								
Instruction in the use of audio-visual materials, equipment										
Yes	37	33.0	1	12.5	9	37.5	9	47.4		
No	73	65.2	7	87.5	15	62.5	10	52.6	2	100.0
No Response	2	1.8								
Emphasis on task orientations by teachers										
Yes	43	38.4	6	75.0	11	45.8	8	42.1	1	50.0
No	66	58.9	2	25.00	13	53.2	11	57.9	1	50.0
No Response	3	2.7								

Table 21 (continued)

Individualizing instruction										
Yes	86	76.8	5	62.5	19	79.2	17	89.5	2	100.0
No	24	21.4	3	37.5	5	20.8	2	10.5		
No Response	2	1.8								
Classroom climate of warmth, support, mutual respect										
Yes	87	77.7	7	87.5	19	79.2	19	100.0	2	100.0
No	23	20.5	1	12.5	5	20.8				
No Response	2	1.8								
Abundance of materials in classrooms available for use by teachers and pupils										
Yes	74	66.1	2	25.0	18	75.0	15	78.9	2	100.0
No	34	30.4	6	75.0	6	25.0	4	21.1		
No Response	4	3.6								
Emphasis on pupil activities in classroom vs. pupil passivity										
Yes	80	71.4	7	87.5	21	87.5	16	84.2	2	100.0
No	30	26.8	1	12.5	3	12.5	3	15.8		
No Response	2	1.8								
The making and use of bulletin boards										
Yes	26	23.2			3	12.5	1	5.3		
No	83	74.1	8	100.0	21	87.5	18	94.7	2	100.0
No Response	3	2.7								

Table 22

Suburban

Perception of Extent to Which Teachers' Needs are Currently Met by Supervisory Services by Category of Respondents

Service		Category									
		N=112 Teachers		N=8 Teachers' Association Officers		N=24 Supervisors		N=19 Principals		N=2 Superintendents	
In-Service		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Low	1	14	12.5	1	12.5	5	20.8				
	2	27	24.1	1	12.5	5	20.8	4	21.1	1	50.0
	3	26	23.2	3	35.5	8	33.3	10	52.6	1	50.0
	4	35	31.3	2	25.0	6	25.0	4	21.1		
High	5	8	7.1	1	12.5			1	5.3		
No Response	6	2	1.8								
Teacher Evaluation											
Low	1	11	9.8	2	25.0	3	12.5				
	2	20	17.9	4	50.0	9	37.5	3	15.8		
	3	29	25.9	2	25.0	5	20.8	8	42.1		
	4	32	28.6			7	29.2	7	36.8	1	50.0
High	5	17	15.2					1	5.3		
									42.1		
No Response	6	3	2.7							1	50.0
Curriculum Improvement											
Low	1	12	10.7	1	12.5	1	4.2				
	2	15	13.4	1	12.5	6	25.0	3	15.8		
	3	38	33.9	1	12.5	6	25.0	8	42.1	1	50.0
	4	35	31.3	5	62.5	9	37.5	7	36.8	1	50.0
High	5	10	8.9			2	8.3	1	5.3		
									42.1		
No Response	6	2	1.8								

Table 22 (continued)

Instructional Supervision Services							S		P		S
Low	1	18	16.1	4	50.0	2	8.3	2	10.5		
	2	24	21.4	4	50.0	5	20.8	2	10.5		
	3	31	27.7			5	20.8	10	52.6		
	4	32	28.6			11	45.8	4	21.1	2	100.0
High	5	4	3.6			1	4.2	1	5.3		
									26		
No Response	6	3	2.7								
All Supervisory Services Considered as a Whole											
Poor	1	13	11.6	1	12.5	1	4.2				
	2	21	18.8	2	25.0	7	29.2	7	36.8	1	50.0
	3	31	27.7	4	50.0	7	29.2	6	31.6		
	4	33	29.5			6	25.0	5	26.3	1	50.0
Excellent	5	13	11.6	1	12.5	3	12.5	1	5.3		
No Response	6	1	0.9								

Table 23

Suburban

Perception of Extent to Which Teachers' Needs are Met by Supervisory Services Compared to Five Years Ago by Category of Respondents

Service		Category									
		N=112 Teachers		N=8 Teachers' Association Officers		N=24 Supervisors		N=19 Principals		N=2 Superintendents	
In-Service		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Low	1	12	10.7	1	12.5	2	8.3				
	2	17	15.2	4	50.0	5	20.8	4	21.1		
	3	28	25.0	1	12.5	11	45.8	5	26.3		
	4	35	31.3	1	12.5	4	16.7	8	42.1	1	50.0
High	5	13	11.6 42.9	1	12.5	2	8.3	2	10.5	1	50.0
No Response	6	7	6.3								
Teacher Evaluation											
Low	1	8	7.1	3	37.5	1	4.2				
	2	19	17.0	2	25.0	6	25.0				
	3	31	27.7	2	25.0	8	33.3	8	42.1		
	4	28	25.0	1	12.5	6	25.0	8	42.1	1	50.0
High	5	17	15.2			3	12.5	3	15.8		
No Response	6	9	8.0							1	50.0
Curriculum Improvement											
Low	1	8	7.1	1	12.5						
	2	18	16.1	2	25.0	5	20.8	2	10.5		
	3	36	32.1	1	12.5	9	37.5	5	26.3		
	4	26	23.2	4	50.0	8	33.3	10	52.6	1	50.0
High	5	16	14.3			2	8.3	2	10.5		
No Response	6	8	7.1							1	50.0

Table 23 (continued)

Instructional Supervision Services											
Low	1	12	10.7	2	25.0	2	8.3	1	5.3		
	2	19	17.0	2	25.0	5	20.8	2	10.5		
	3	30	26.8	2	25.0	4	16.7	5	26.3		
	4	34	30.4	2	25.0	12	50.0	9	47.4	1	50.0
High	5	8	7.1			1	4.2	2	10.5		
No Response	6	9	8.0							1	50.0
All Supervisory Services Considered as a Whole											
Poorer	1	11	9.8	1	12.5	1	4.2				
	2	12	10.7	3	37.5	3	12.5	2	10.5	1	50.0
	3	32	28.6	4	50.0	8	33.3	6	31.6		
	4	29	25.9			8	33.3	9	47.4		
Better	5	20	17.9			4	16.7	2	10.5		
No Response	6	8	7.1							1	50.0

Table 24

Suburban

A Comparison of the Perceptions of the Extent to Which Teachers' Needs are Met by Supervisory Services Compared to Five Years Ago by Catagory of Respondents

Service		Category N=112 Teachers		N=8 Teachers' Association Officers		N=24 Supervisors		N=19 Principals		N=2 Superintendents	
In-Service		Now	5 Yrs. Ago	Now	5 Yrs. Ago	Now	5 Yrs. Ago	Now	5 Yrs. Ago	Now	5 Yrs. Ago
Low	1,2	36.6	25.9	25.0	62.5	41.6	29.1	21.1	21.1	16.7	22.2
High	4,5	38.4	42.9	37.5	25.0	25.0	25.0	26.4	52.6	? 27.8	61.1
Teacher Evaluation											
Low	1,2	27.7	24.1	75.0	62.5	50.0	29.2	15.8		22.2	11.1
High	4,5	43.8	40.2		12.5	29.2	37.5	41.2	57.9	38.9	55.5
Curriculum Improvement											
Low	1,2	24.1	23.2	25.0	37.5	29.2	20.8	15.8	10.5	5.6	
High	4,5	40.2	37.5	62.5	50.0	45.8	41.6	42.1	63.1	55.5	72.2
Instructional Supervision Services											
Low	1,2	37.5	27.7	100.0	50.0	29.1	29.1	21.0	15.8	16.7	16.7
High	4,5	32.2	37.5		25.0	50.0	54.2	26.4	57.9	38.9 ?	44.4
All Supervisory Services Considered as a Whole											
Poorer	1,2	30.4	20.5	37.5	50.0	33.4	16.7	36.8	10.5	27.8	27.8
Better	4,5	41.1	43.8	12.5		37.5	50.0	31.6	57.9	38.9	44.5

both currently and compared to five years ago; principals tended to hold a somewhat lower view of current services than teachers and supervisors, but tended to rate the services higher than other groups compared to five years ago. Considering the last item in Table 24, teachers more than other groups tended to feel their current needs are met to a high degree (41.1%) and supervisors (50.0%) and principals (57.9%) more than other group tended to feel that supervisory services were better than five years ago.

Responsibility for Various Supervisory Functions by Level of School Organizations.

As school divisions organize for supervisory services, some lack of clarity may develop about level of responsibility for various services. Tables 25, 26, and 27 report the findings for the three suburban schools in this study. In general, teachers, supervisors and principals tended to agree about level of responsibility at the central office and decentralized office (where this applied). However, some disparity of responses between groups did appear in considering responsibility for supervisory services at the building levels (Table 27). Generally principals tended to see more responsibility at the building level for all services than other groups.

Table 25

Suburban

Perceived Amount of Responsibility Assumed for Various Supervisory Functions by Level of School Organization by Category of Respondents

Level-Central Office

Function	Category N=112 Teachers		N=8 Teachers' Association Officers		N=24 Supervisors		N=19 Principals		N=2 Superintendents	
Staff Development	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	5	4.5	2	25.0	2	8.3	2	10.5		
2	69	61.6	5	62.5	16	66.7	12	63.2	2	100.0
3	20	17.9			5	20.8	4	21.1		
4	1	0.9					1	5.3		
5	17	15.2	1	12.5	1	4.2				
Teacher Evaluation										
1	4	3.6								
2	14	12.5	4	50.0	4	16.7	3	15.8	1	50.0
3	64	57.1	3	37.5	15	62.5	13	68.4	1	50.0
4	5	4.5			1	4.2				
5	25	22.3	1	12.5	4	16.7	3	15.8		
Curriculum Improvement Projects										
1	16	14.3	2	25.0	2	8.3	2	10.5		
2	62	55.4	5	62.5	16	66.7	14	73.7	2	100.0
3	21	18.8			5	20.8	2	10.5		
4										
5	13	11.6	1	12.5	1	4.2	1	5.3		
Instructional Supervision										
1	5	4.5	1	12.5						
2	30	26.8	2	25.0	10	41.7	8	42.1	2	100.0
3	54	48.2	4	50.0	12	50.0	8	42.1		
4	1	0.9								
5	22	19.6	1	12.5	2	8.3	3	15.8		

1=Primary or sole responsibility
2=Shared responsibility
3=Limited or no responsibility
4=Not applicable
5=Missing data

Table 26

Suburban

Perceived Amount of Responsibility Assumed for Various Supervisory Functions by Level of School Organization by Category of Respondents

Level-Decentralized Offices

Function	Category									
	N=112 Teachers		N=8 Teachers' Association Officers		N=24 Supervisors		N=19 Principals		N=2 Superintendents	
Staff Development	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	3	2.7								
2	31	27.7			9	37.5	5	26.3		
3	10	8.9	1	12.5	3	12.5	2	10.5		
4	34	30.4	5	62.5	7	29.2	7	36.8	1	50.0
5	34	30.4	2	25.0	5	20.8	5	26.3	1	50.0
Teacher Evaluation										
1	2	1.8								
2	10	8.9			2	8.3	1	5.3		
3	25	22.3	1	12.5	9	37.5	6	31.6		
4	37	33.0	5	62.5	7	29.2	7	36.8	1	50.0
5	38	33.9	2	25.0	6	25.0	5	26.3	1	50.0
Curriculum Improvement Projects										
1	8	7.1			2	8.3	2	10.5		
2	29	25.9			8	33.3	3	15.8		
3	9	8.0	1	12.5	3	12.5	3	15.8		
4	31	27.7	5	62.5	7	29.2	7	36.8	1	50.0
5	35	31.3	2	25.0	4	16.7	4	21.1	1	50.0
Instructional Supervision										
1	3	2.7					1	5.3		
2	18	16.1			8	33.3	4	21.1		
3	22	19.6	1	12.5	5	20.8	3	15.8		
4	34	30.4	5	62.5	7	29.2	7	36.8	1	50.0
5	35	31.3	2	25.0	4	16.7	4	21.1	1	50.0

1=Primary or sole responsibility
2=Shared responsibility
3=Limited or no responsibility
4=Not applicable
5=Missing data

Table 27

Suburban

Perceived Amount of Responsibility Assumed for Various Supervisory Functions by Level of School Organization by Category of Respondents

Level-Building Principal

Function	Category									
	N=112 Teachers		N=8 Teachers' Association Officers		N=24 Supervisors		N=19 Principals		N=2 Superintendents	
Staff Development	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1	33	29.5	2	25.0	7	29.2	7	36.8		
2	70	62.5	5	62.5	14	58.3	11	57.9	2	100.0
3	1	0.9	1	12.5	2	8.3				
4										
5	8	7.1			1	4.2	1	5.3		
Teacher Evaluation										
1	80	71.4	7	87.5	18	75.0	16	84.2	2	100.0
2	25	22.3	1	12.5	5	20.8	1	5.3		
3	3	2.7					2	10.5		
4										
5	4	3.6			1	4.2				
Curriculum Improvement Projects										
1	12	10.7	2	25.0	4	16.7	4	21.1		
2	70	62.5	4	50.0	15	62.5	14	73.7	2	100.0
3	15	13.4	2	25.0	4	16.7	1	5.3		
4										
5	15	13.4			1	4.2				
Instructional Supervision										
1	53	47.3	6	75.0	8	33.3	13	68.4		
2	41	36.6	2	25.0	14	58.3	5	26.3	2	100.0
3	11	9.8			1	4.2	1	5.3		
4										
5	7	6.3			1	4.2				

1=Primary or sole responsibility
2=Shared responsibility
3=Limited or no responsibility
4=Not applicable
5=Missing data

STRUCTURED INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Structured Interview Schedule

To supplement the statistical information obtained from the questionnaires, structured interviews were conducted with each of the groups (superintendents, assistant superintendents, supervisors, principals, teachers' organization officers, and teachers). Information obtained from these groups is reported by district type below.

Question: "Have supervisory services increased, remained about the same, or declined during the last five years and what do you think are the reasons?"

Large City

Superintendents, Assistant Superintendents.

Prevailing opinion at this level was that services had increased or remained about the same . Reasons given included decentralization; more vigorous assumption of supervisory services by other groups (rather than by those designated as supervisors as formerly) such as building principals, team leaders, senior teachers, assistant principals; "soft money" personnel; special emphases (on reading and math, for example); accountability, and different deployment of personnel available (instructional resource teams, for example as opposed to a one-to-one concept of supervision).

Supervisors.

The large majority reported that supervisory services have declined. Reasons given for the decline follow (in order of mention): personnel cuts (as a result of diminished budgets), negotiated agreements with teachers' unions, and increasing demands that result from increased special programs and the shift to a mostly minority student population. Those who felt supervisory services had increased cited increases in federal funds and changes in their roles that have helped them be better received by teachers.

Principals.

The large majority responded that supervisory services have declined. Several lines of thought led them to their conclusions (in order of mention): increased time demands on principals (paperwork, parents), reduction in support personnel that formerly delivered supervisory services, shift in responsibilities for some of those who formerly assisted in delivering supervisory services. Those who perceived supervisory services increasing attributed this to their commitment to increase their own supervisory services to teachers.

Teachers' organization officers

There was a wider dispersion of responses from this group than the earlier ones. A plurality felt that supervisory services had remained about the same. There was an even division of the remainder between those who felt they had increased and those who felt they had declined. Reasons given for their views were widely distributed with many of them tied to specific union concerns in that district. Several union leaders who said services had declined, noted a shift in supervisor responsibilities from assisting to a more judgemental, evaluative role.

Teachers

A variation in responses was also recorded in this group. A plurality responded that supervisory services had remained about the same. Several suggested that they needed little supervisory help and, therefore, whatever they receive was adequate. Those who saw supervisory services in decline mentioned reductions in personnel and other demands on the time of the remaining supervisory personnel as contributing factors. Those perceiving increased services cited changed attitudes of supervisors (more interested in providing help) and increased availability of materials.

Question: "To what degree do you think any of the following factors are contributors to the increase, same level, or decline in supervisory services?"

The responses of each of the groups were recorded by interviewers and the responses are presented in the tables following. In Table 1 we find that the declining enrollments most large city districts are experiencing are not perceived to have an effect on the level of supervisory services by 19 of ~~31~~ 41 respondents. Where declining enrollments were seen to have a substantial effect (10 respondents), this effect was, as might be expected, more often associated with declines in supervisory services (6 of the 10 respondents). Supervisors and principals were more likely to assign substantial effects on supervisory services to enrollment declines than other respondents. Illustration of the weak association of declines in enrollment with declines in supervisory services is that only 6 of 17 respondents assigned substantial effects on supervisory services to declines in enrollments.

By contrast, Table 2 shows a strong association between declines in budgets and declines in supervisory services. Of 17 respondents noting a decline in supervisory services, 14 assigned substantial effects due to declining budgets. Data supplied by the school districts verified a substantial budget decline (per pupil expenditure) in only two districts. The widely held view that there are budget declines may be explained by noting that total budgets have declined (due to pupil attrition) and fixed costs remain the same, thus increasing the percentage of the budget that must be allocated to fixed expenses. Other budgetary constraints are state and federal educational mandates (such as P.L. 94-142), that earmark funds, thus reducing budget flexibility. Curiously, of the 10 respondents who saw

Table 1

Large Cities

Effect of Declining Enrollments on Change in Level of Supervisory Services as Perceived by Superintendents, Supervisors, Principals, Officials of Teachers' Associations and Teachers

	Supervisory Services Have Increased			Supervisory Services Have Remained the Same			Supervisory Services Have Declined		
	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect
1.	1		3	1	2	1			
2.	1		1				3	1	1
3.			2		1		3	2	1
4.			1			3		2	
5.			1	1	2	3		2	2

1. Superintendents
2. Supervisors
3. Principals
4. Officers of Teachers' Associations
5. Teachers

Table 2

Large Cities

The Effects of Diminishing Revenues On Change in Level of Supervisory Services As Perceived by Superintendents, Supervisors, Principals, Officers of Teachers' Associations and Teachers

	Supervisory Services Have Increased			Supervisory Services Have Remained the Same			Supervisory Services Have Declined		
	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect
1.	2	1	1*	3	1				
2.	1		1*				5		
3.	1	1		1			5		1*
4.			1	2		1	2		1*
5.	1			2	2	1, 1*	2	1	

1. Superintendents
2. Supervisors
3. Principals
4. Officers of Teachers' Associations
5. Teachers

* Slight increase in revenues (rather than decline).

an increase in supervisory services, 5 assigned a substantial effect to diminishing revenues on the increase in supervisory services. Some of these respondents felt the supervisory services were leaner, but improved nonetheless.

One of the most persistent dictums in educational literature is that principals should be instructional leaders, including supervision. Table 3 suggests that this is a rather mixed picture. Of 18 respondents who felt supervisory services had declined, 11 assigned substantial effect to the principal's (in)ability to provide instructional support services. By contrast, of the 10 respondents who perceived supervisory services had increased, only 2 assigned substantial effect for that increase to the building principal's ability to provide instructional support services.

Interesting differences between groups emerged from the question on the effect of collective bargaining on level of supervisory services as shown in Table 4. Only one group, principals, strongly associated collective bargaining with declines in supervisory services (presumably their own ability to provide instructional support services) as 5 of 9 respondents so indicated. On the other hand, superintendents and teachers, seeing collective bargaining from entirely different perspectives, with one exception, agreed that collective bargaining has not had a substantial influence on the level of supervisory services. From this it appears that principals feel more acutely the erosion of their supervisory prerogatives as a result of collective bargaining.

Decentralization is widely thought to be associated with improved school services. In our sample only three of the seven school districts were decentralized. Considering the small number of districts, interpretation of data must be approached cautiously. Considering the responses of

Table 3

Large Cities

The Effects of Building Principals' Ability To Provide Instructional Support Services on Change In Level of Supervisory Services as Perceived by Superintendents, Supervisors, Principals, Officers of Teachers' Associations and Teachers

	Supervisory Services Have Increased			Supervisory Services Have Remained the Same			Supervisory Services Have Declined		
	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect
1.	2	1	1		2	2			
2.							4	2	
3.		1	1		1		2	2	
4.			1	1	1	1	1	1	
5.		1		1		5	2	1	1

1. Superintendents
2. Supervisors
3. Principals
4. Officers of Teachers' Associations
5. Teachers

Table 4

Large Cities

The Effect of Collective Bargaining on Change in Level of Supervisory Services As Perceived by Superintendents, Supervisors, Principals, Officers of Teachers' Associations and Teachers

	Supervisory Services Have Increased			Supervisory Services Have Remained the Same			Supervisory Services Have Declined		
	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect
1.		1	2		3	1			
2.	2	1					3	2	
3.		2				1	5		1
4.			1			3		2	
5.		1			1	5	1		3

1. Superintendents
2. Supervisors
3. Principals
4. Officers of Teachers' Associations
5. Teachers

Table 5

Large Cities

The Effects of Decentralization On Change in Level of Supervisory Services As Perceived by Superintendents, Supervisors Principals, Officers of Teachers' Associations and Teachers

	Supervisory Services Have Increased			Supervisory Services Have Remained the Same			Supervisory Services Have Declined		
	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect
1.	2**		1, 1**	2**	1				
2.	1 , 1***						1**		
3.	2**			1**			1	4, 1**	3
4.						1	1**		1
5.			1			2			2, 1**

1. Superintendents
2. Supervisors
3. Principals
4. Officers of Teachers' Associations
5. Teachers

* One of the respondents thought decentralization had a substantial negative effect on the overall increase in supervisory service.

** Respondents were in decentralized districts.

Note: Only three of the seven districts covered in this study were decentralized.

"substantial effect" and "some effect" together, of the three decentralized districts, decentralization was credited with increased services by four respondents (omitting the single star response) and declining services by four respondents (including the single star response). (Table 5)

The results from this small sample suggests there is a lack of concensus on the effect of decentralization on supervisory services. Similarly, it seems fair to conclude that more decentralization does not make a substantial contribution to an increase of supervisory services.

Only three of the districts had been subjected to a management efficiency study in the previous five years. Nine responses were received from personnel in these districts. No suggested pattern of relationships emerged from these responses. The effects of management efficiency studies on level of supervisory services remains moot. (Table 6)

In summary, of the factors studied, the strongest perceived influences on the level of supervisory services are declining budgets and principals' (in)ability to provide instructional support services. Declining student populations, decentralization, and management efficiency studies have had a less clear influence on level of supervisory services.

Question: "Can you think of any other factors that may have made a contribution to the increase, same level or decline in supervisory services?"

The most frequent response to this final probe for information yielded a number of comments on the role and function of the supervisor. Of particular interest was the fact that several districts had reorganized or redefined the role of supervisor and this was closely associated with perceptions of improved or declining supervisory services. Sample comments were:

Improved: "Special programs focusing emphasis on improved instruction"

Table 6

Large Cities

The Effects of Management Efficiency Studies by External Groups on Level of Supervisory Services as Perceived by Superintendents, Supervisors Principals, Officers of Teachers' Associations and Teachers

	Supervisory Services Have Increased			Supervisory Services Have Remained the Same			Supervisory Services Have Declined		
	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect
1.	1	1*	2		1, 1*	2			
2.			1					1, 1*	2
3.	1*		1*		1*			1	4, 1*
4.			1			2			1, 1*
5.			1			3		1*	

1. Superintendents
2. Supervisors
3. Principals
4. Officers of Teachers' Associations
5. Teachers

*Has had a management efficiency study conducted.

"Changed teacher perception of supervisors due to change in title, functions"
"Improved relationship between supervisors, teachers"
"Supervisors want to the helpful"

Declined: "Redefinition of the role of supervisors"
"Teachers associate supervision with evaluation"
"Supervisors fail to deal through principals"
"Teachers are resistant to supervisory services"
"Supervision has negative connotations"
"Visits by principals are for formal evaluation only."

From these quotations, it seems clear that the role of supervisor can be changed and that this change influences the way supervisors are perceived. Not surprisingly, when supervisors are perceived as wanting to be helpful (versus being evaluative, judgmental) supervisory services are perceived as improved.

Desegregation was perceived by all categories of respondents as making a contribution to the level of supervisory services and these were most often associated with supervisory services remaining the same.

Accountability was mentioned by several respondents and was most often associated with improved supervisory services.

Inservice was mentioned by all categories and the most frequent concern was a lack of time for teachers to participate. This seems to be a widely perceived problem; administrators would do well to seek solutions.

In summary, the additional probe for contributors to the perceived level of supervision produced comments suggesting that: (1) the role of the supervisor can be changed and that these changes are associated with perceived improvements in supervisory services, (2) accountability is generally associated with the perceived improvement of supervisory services, and (3) time for teachers to participate in inservice is a substantial factor in whether supervisory services are perceived to be improving or declining.

Medium Cities

"Have supervisory services increased, remained about the same or declined during the last five years, and what do you think are the reasons?"

Superintendents

Those superintendents who perceived an increase in supervisory services attributed the increase to public and board demands for improvement of instruction, state mandated competency test standards, move toward more emphasis on the basics, district-wide emphasis on supervision, and training for principals and team leaders on supervisory skills. Those who saw services at essentially the same level noted their major change in organization had occurred over five years ago. Those who saw a decline attributed it to budget problems and authoritarian oriented supervisors.

Supervisors

An increase in supervisory services was attributed to the non-evaluative, non-threatening role of supervisors, involvement of teachers, better teacher-supervisory-principal communication, and more federally funded specialists. The same level of services was attributed to an increase at the elementary level and a decrease at the secondary, more emphasis placed on building-level supervision, a shift in emphasis from curriculum development to in service (which takes less time) and principal's lacking the time and skills to provide supervisory services. Those who saw a decline in services noted a decline in supervisory personnel and a shifting of the responsibility for supervision from supervisors to building principals.

Principals

Principals mentioned the following as contributing to an increase in services: demands of the board of education, their own desire to increase supervisory services, decentralization, public demand for improved education, addition of coordinating teachers, and more responsibility for supervision being placed on principals. The same level of services was assigned to the following causes: decentralization resulting in confusion regarding functions of supervisors, supervisors reacting to requests rather than initiating change, declines in personnel, diminishing revenues, more money for direct instructional support, union pressures for reduction of central office staff, and an increase in teacher observations combined with a decrease in inservice. Those who saw supervisory services in decline cited the following reasons: limited principal time to perform supervisory activities, reductions in personnel, elimination of district inservice courses for increment credit, and restrictive union contracts.

Teachers' Organization Officers

Only one respondent felt services had increased and assigned this to the negotiated agreement that clarified understandings between teachers and administration. Those who saw supervisory services remaining the same saw lack of time for supervision, evaluation for RIFing teachers rather than improvement of instruction, and reduction in central office supervisors as causal factors. One respondent saw services in decline and attributed this largely to a decrease in supervisory personnel.

Teachers

A minority of teachers felt services had increased and attributed the increase to decentralization, community/school board pressure for accountability, and state level minimum standards for graduation. The majority of teachers saw supervisory services at about the same level and cited special instructional emphases programs (in compensation for reductions in supervisory personnel), shifts in personnel (leaving about the same number of supervisory positions), reductions in supervisory personnel, and decreased authority of supervisors. No teachers in the sample felt supervision had decreased.

In summary, respondents who saw supervisory services on the increase were generally in agreement in attributing this increase to public and board demands for the improvement of instruction, state mandated competency standards, and special programs of emphasis on the improvement of instruction. Beyond these general areas of agreement, the various groups tended to attribute increases in light of their own special perspective, union leaders citing contract agreement, for example. Those who saw supervisory services at the same level often saw them improved in some respects and declined in others with the over-all level remaining about the same. Reasons given by most categories of respondents included reductions in supervisory personnel and shifts in emphases of services. Again, beyond this general agreement, responses reflected their special perspective as, for example, supervisors saying principals lacked the skills to provide supervisory services. Those who saw supervisory services in decline, agreed that decline in personnel was a causal factor. One other factor cited was an emphasis on building level supervision. Beyond these two, a scattering of factors were mentioned. Interestingly, no teachers interviewed saw supervisory services in decline.

"To what degree do you think any of the following factors are contributors to the increase, same level, or decline in supervisory services?"

Declining Enrollments

As shown in Table 7, enrollment decreases were not perceived as having much effect on level of services overall, with 22 of 39 respondents selecting no effect. Those who saw supervisory services at the same level were most likely to assign some or substantial effect to declining enrollments.

Collective Bargaining

Reviewing Table 8 it appears that principals feel most strongly the impact of collective bargaining on level of supervisory services and that this impact is predominantly unhelpful to provision of those services. Of 13 principals responding, 5 assigned no effect for increased services to collective bargaining whereas 5 assigned substantial effect by collective bargaining to the decrease in services they perceived. Overall, collective bargaining did not appear to play a major role in level of supervisory services as only 12 of 40 respondents assigned substantial effects to the level of services contrasted with 20 who saw no effects.

Decentralization

No clear patterns emerged from the respondents on the question of the effect of decentralization on level of supervisory services. For example, 12 respondents saw a substantial effect on all levels of supervisory services, and another 11 saw no effects. Various categories of respondents revealed no pattern either, with the possible exception of principals. However, that pattern is difficult to interpret since an equal number of principals (3) attributed a substantial effect by decentralization to an increase in services and a decrease in serivces. (Table 9)

Table 7

Medium Size Cities

Effect of Declining Enrollments On Change in Level of Supervisory Services As Perceived by Superintendents, Supervisors, Principals, Officers of Teachers' Associations and Teachers

	Supervisory Services Have Increased			Supervisory Services Have Remained the Same			Supervisory Services Have Declined		
	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect
1.	1	2	1			1		2	1
2.		1	1		1, 1*		1**		2, 1**
3.			5	1	1	1*	1	2	3
4.			1		1	1			1
5.***		1	1		1	2			

1. Superintendents
2. Supervisors
3. Principals
4. Officers of Teachers' Association
5. Teachers

* Slight increase in enrollment

** Supervisors could not agree; therefore, two responses accepted

*** One group of teachers did not feel qualified to comment on the effect of enrollment on level of supervisory services

Table 8

Medium Size Cities

Effect of Collective Bargaining on Change in Level of Supervisory Services as Perceived by Superintendents, Supervisors, Principals, Officers of Teachers' Associations and Teachers

	Supervisory Services Have Increased			Supervisory Services Have Remained the Same			Supervisory Services Have Declined		
	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect
1.	3	1				1		1	2
2.		1	1	1		1	1*	1*	2
3.			5	1		1, 1**	5		1
4.		1		1		1			1
5.		2			1	3			

1. Superintendents
2. Supervisors
3. Principals
4. Officers of Teachers' Associations
5. Teachers

* Respondents could not agree, so two answers recorded

** Respondents noted this was not applicable

Table 9

Medium Size Cities

Effect of Decentralization On Change in Level of Supervisory Services As Perceived by Superintendents, Supervisors, Principals, Officers of Teachers' Associations and Teachers

	Supervisory Services Have Increased			Supervisory Services Have Remained the Same			Supervisory Services Have Declined		
	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect
1.		2	1	1					3
2.	1			1	1		1	1	1
3.	3					2	3	1	2
4.		2		1		1			1
5.	1	1			1				

1. Superintendents
2. Supervisors
3. Principals
4. Officers of Teachers' Associations
5. Teachers

Building Principal's Ability to Provide Instructional Support Services

Several confusing relationships were revealed in Table 10 For example, where supervisory services were perceived to have increased, substantial effects for that increased were assigned by 8 respondents. However, where services were perceived to have decreased, the same number of respondents, 8, assigned no effect. In other words, when services have increased, the building principal receives credit; however, where services decrease, he does not bear the blame. Interestingly, principals themselves divided on this issue: where they perceived services as declining, 3 assigned substantial effect for that decline to principals and 3 assigned no effect at all. Half of the teachers, the most direct recipients of supervisory services, assigned no effect to principals' ability on level of services. Only one teacher group assigned substantial effects.

Declining revenues

No pattern was discernable with respect to effect of declining revenues on supervisory services. While substantial effects were assigned by 10 of the respondents, no effects were assigned by 15 respondents. Superintendents in particular tend to be involved with budgets. Of the 4 who perceived increases, 2 assigned substantial effect on budget decrease; of the 3 who perceived decreases in supervisory services, 2 assigned substantial effects to the decrease in budgets. Similar responses were recorded by principals. Teachers' organization officers, another group sensitive to budget issues, did not attribute substantial budgetary effects on any perceived level of services. (Table 11)

Table 10

Medium Size Cities

The Effect of Building Principals' Ability To Provide Instructional Support Services on Change In Level of Supervisory Services as Perceived by Superintendents, Supervisors, Principals, Officers of Teachers' Associations and Teachers

	Supervisory Services Have Increased			Supervisory Services Have Remained the Same			Supervisory Services Have Declined		
	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect
1.	2	1	1			1		1	2
2.	1	1		1	1		1		2
3.	5			1	2		3		3
4.		1		1		1			1
5.			2	1	2	1			

1. Superintendents
2. Supervisors
3. Principals
4. Officers of Teachers' Associations
5. Teachers

Table 11

Medium Size Cities

The Effect of Diminishing Revenues on Change in Level of Supervisory Services as Perceived by Superintendents, Supervisors, Principals, Officers of Teachers' Associations and Teachers

	Supervisory Services Have Increased			Supervisory Services Have Remained the Same			Supervisory Services Have Declined		
	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect
1.	2	1	1			1	2	1	
2.	1		1	1		1***	1, 1**	1	1**
3*	2		3	1	1		3	1	2
4.		1				2		1	
5.			2	2	1	1			

1. Superintendents
2. Supervisors
3. Principals
4. Officers of Teachers' Associations
5. Teachers

* One principal group did not respond, noting that revenues had increased, not declined

** Respondents could not agree, so two answers recorded

*** Respondents noted that revenues have increased

Management Efficiency Studies

These studies have tended to be associated with some increase in services and relatively disassociated from a decrease in services. For example, 12 of 14 respondents who perceived increased superviosry services, assigned some or substantial effects to these studies. By contrast, where supervisory services were viewed as declining, only 6 of 11 respondents attributed some or substantial effects to management studies. (Table 12)

Summary

Respondents from medium size cities did not perceive relationships between level of supervisory serivces and declining enrollments, decentralization and declining revenues. Collective bargaining appears to impact negatively on principals' views of level of supervisory services; however, other groups did not assign major effects on services to collective bargaining. Management efficiency studies provided the lone association that suggested a consistent view of the impact of a factor on level of services, this impact being perceived positively.

"Can you think of any other factors that may have made a contribution to the increase, same level or decline in supervisory services?"

State mandated programs and requirements were mentioned by 4 of the 5 groups and were the leading additional reasons cited for the current level of services. Those who saw services at an increased level, at the same level or decreased all cited state mandates; consequently we are forced to conclude that mandates are perceived to be working for both an improved and decreased level of supervisory services as perceived by the respondents surveyed. Public pressure was mentioned by 3 of the 4 groups and was the

Table 12

Medium Size Cities

The Effects of Management Efficiency Studies by External Groups on Level of Supervisory Services as Perceived by Superintendents, Supervisors, Principals, Officers of Teachers' Associations and Teachers

	Supervisory Services Have Increased			Supervisory Services Have Remained the Same			Supervisory Services Have Declined		
	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect
1.	3	1				1		3	
2*		1	1*	1	1			1	1
3.	2	3				2, 1*	1	1	3
4.			1*		1	1			1
5.	1	1				1, 1*			

1. Superintendents
2. Supervisors
3. Principals
4. Officers of Teachers' Associations
5. Teachers

* One school system has just received the report, but it has yet been implemented.

most frequently mentioned causal factor. In every instance, the pressures were associated with a decrease in supervisory services. Included in public pressure were such public concerns as demands for decreases in administrative personnel, demands for basic education, and special interest group influence on the board. Another frequently mentioned category was building level emphasis on supervision, and in every instance, this was associated with an increased level of services. Included in this category were such items as principals working with teachers on objectives, required observations of teachers and emphasis on the principal as instructional leader. However, the only two groups to mention this category were superintendents and principals; supervisors and teachers have felt little impact from this emphasis, according to the responses received. Lack of time was a final category noted by more than one group of respondents and this was in each case associated with a decrease in services.

Suburban

Several school districts in the orginial sample were unable to cooperate in the study and the resulting substitutions reduced the sample of suburban districts to three. Generalizing from such a small sample must be undertaken with great caution. With this background, the following summary of data is offered.

"Have supervisory services increased, remained about the same or declined during the last five years and what do you think are the reasons?"

Superintendents, Assistant Superintendents

Responses were evenly divided between those who felt they had remained the same, increased, and declined. Those who perceived an increase, attributed this to an increase in district size, thus necessitating an increased supervisory services program. The principal was the focus of instructional leadership, with evaluation of faculty increased in intensity and more supervision of those with problems.

The superintendent who perceived they had remained the same noted an increase in external sources (service center, professional association workshop, college courses by extension, and so forth). However, there was a decrease in direct support services (face to face consultations, materials) due to increases in paperwork.

The superintendent who registered a decline in supervisory service attributed this to declines in budget that necessitated a reduction in supervisory personnel and in some curriculum projects funded by the district.

Supervisors

Two groups of the three indicated supervisory services have improved with the remaining one split between improved and declined. Those that thought they had improved cited a changed teacher view of the supervisor as help rather than evaluator, use of a structured observation and appraisal system and improved coordination between principal and supervisor. The third district which recorded both an increase and decrease, felt the increases had occurred at the building level (particularly teachers assisting other teachers). However, articulation between buildings was seen to be substantially decreased.

Principals

Of the eight groups of respondents, two noted increases, three felt they had remained the same and three saw a decline. Those who perceived increases credited a structured observation and evaluation program, an increase in the number of supervisors, more curriculum guides and an increased inclination on the part of the teachers to ask supervisors for assistance. Those who rated supervisory services about the same saw less help from the district level but some growth at the building level in providing these services. Those indicating declines in supervisory services commented on declines in number of personnel, consequent increased responsibilities for the principal (making the job impossible) and no evaluation of any of it.

Teacher's organization officers

One saw an increase, one, about the same, one a decline. Increases were credited to increased number of personnel. While there had been much shuffling of supervisory responsibilities, the net effect was about the same level of services, in one respondent's view. The decline noted by one was attributed to lowering the priority of supervisory services.

Teachers

Teachers from only one district were interviewed. They saw an increase in staff development activities, but otherwise perceived services as about the same. They suggested no reasons for this level of supervisory services.

In summary, of the three suburban districts visited, a structured observation and evaluation system, increased tendency of the teachers to request supervisory services, and a change of emphasis from supervision service being provided at the district level to supervisory services at the building level were chiefly associated with improved supervisory services. Declines were attributed to reductions in personnel.

"To what degree do you think any of the following factors are contributors to the increase (same level, decline) in supervisory services?"

As can be seen in Table 13 declining enrollments was not a potent influence on supervisory services in these suburban districts as they have been experiencing increases, rather than declines in population. Again, collective barganing was viewed as having no effect on the level of supervisory services by 13 of 20 respondents. Only one of the three districts had collective bargaining to any degree and this was seen as having a substantial effect by only two of the respondents in that district. (Table 14)

Several questionnaires were unusable on the issue of decentralization. Of those that were usable, decentralization did not appear to be a significant influence on supervisory services with 5 of 7 respondents registering no effect. (Table 15)

The building principal's ability to provide support services showed one of the stronger effects with 11 of 19 respondents indicating this factor had some or substantial effect on the level of supervisory services. Interestingly,

Table 13

Suburban

The Effect of Declining Enrollments On Change in Level of Supervisory Services As Perceived by Superintendents, Supervisors, Principals, Officers of Teachers' Associations and Teachers

	Supervisory Services **Have Increased**			Supervisory Services Have Remained the **Same**			Supervisory Services **Have Declined**		
	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect
1.			1			1			2
2.			2			1			
3.			2		1	2			3
4.						3			
5.						2			

1. Superintendent
2. Supervisors
3. Principals
4. Officers of Teachers' Associations
5. Teachers

Table 14

Suburban

The Effect of Collective Bargaining On Change in Level of Supervisory Services As Perceived by Superintendents, Supervisors, Principals, Officers of Teachers' Associations and Teachers

	Supervisory Services Have Increased			Supervisory Services Have Remained the Same			Supervisory Services Have Declined		
	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect
1.			1			1			2
2.			2		1				
3.			2	1	1	1	1	2	
4.			1		1	1			
5.						2			

1. Superintendent
2. Supervisors
3. Principals
4. Officers of Teachers' Associations
5. Teachers

Table 15

Suburban

The Effect of Decentralization* on Change in Level of Supervisory Services As Perceived by Superintendents, Supervisors, Principals, Officers of Teachers' Associations and Teachers

	Supervisory Services Have Increased			Supervisory Services Have Remained the Same			Supervisory Services Have Declined		
	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect
1.						1 ✓			
2.			1						
3.		1							
4.						2			
5.					1	1			

1. Superintendent
2. Supervisors
3. Principals
4. Officers of Teachers' Associations
5. Teachers

* Several questionnaires were unusable.

whether the services were perceived as *Increasing*, *Remaining the Same* or *Declining*, the Principals were predominantly seen as having *some* or substantial effect. (Table 16)

Respondents produced a strong pattern (Table 17) in their responses on the effect of diminishing revenues on level of supervisory services. Where services were perceived to be declining, all five respondents attributed a substantial contribution to a decline in revenues. Revenues were not viewed as such a strong causal factor where services have remained the same or increased. No data were gathered for the influence of management efficiency studies, since neither of the three districts had commissioned a management efficiency study.

In summary, the strongest causal factors for each level of supervisory services in suburban schools were those of principal's ability to provide instructional support services and declining revenues.

"Can you think of any *other* factors that may have made a contribution to the increase, (same level or decline) in supervisory services?"

In response to this question, time was mentioned by three of the five categories of respondents. Surprisingly, only the superintendents' group category related the time factor to a decline in supervisory services. The supervisor and teacher respondents indicated services were at the same level or increasing.

A category, *Personnel and Policy*, was created to cover a number of related items volunteered by respondents. Under Personnel, selection of a top administrator and careful selection of principals were listed (the former related to an increase in supervisory services; the latter to maintenance of the same level of supervisory services). The Policy

Table 16

Suburban

The Effect of the Building Principal's Ability to Provide Supervisory Services on Change in Level of Supervisory Services as Perceived by Superintendents, Supervisors, Principals, Officers of Teachers' Associations and Teachers

	Supervisory Services Have Increased			Supervisory Services Have Remained the Same			Supervisory Services Have Declined		
	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect
1.		1			1			1	1
2.		2			1				
3.	1	1	1	1	1	1		2	
4.						2			
5.					1	1			

1. Superintendent
2. Supervisors
3. Principals
4. Officers of Teachers' Associations
5. Teachers

Table 17

Suburban

The Effect of Diminishing Revenues on Change in Level of Supervisory Services as Perceived by Superintendents, Supervisors , Principals, Officers of Teachers' Associations and Teachers

	Supervisory Services Have Increased			Supervisory Services Have Remained the Same			Supervisory Services Have Declined		
	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect
1.		1				1	2		
2.		1	1		1				
3.		1	1			3	3		
4.				1	1				
5.						2			

1. Superintendent
2. Supervisors
3. Principals
4. Officers of Teachers' Associations
5. Teachers

category included such matters as shift from direct supervision to curriculum development (increase) and the decision to emphasize services by central administration. The same level of services was associated with such policy decisions as a lack of common direction, confusion about the principal's role in supervision, lack of an identifiable plan for instructional priorities and solicitation of teachers' choices for inservice. A decline in services was associated with the failure of curriculum projects to become related to district goals.

Other responses in answer to this question included growth of district (I), state accountability act (I) and, principals are committed to supervision, botn the giving of and training others to give (I). Those who perceived supervisory services at the same level noted that more supervisory services are available from other sources, special emphases (such as 94-142) that shift services from other areas, poor communication, and lack of consultant visibility. The respondents who viewed services as declining, mentioned parent intervention.

In summary, a shortage of time and key policy decisions seemed to be the most important factors emerging from this final probe. In particular, suburban administrators may want to consider the implication in response to this question that policy decisions either positive (to emphasize supervision) or negative (failure to clarify the principal's role in supervision) seem to penetrate the system and substantially affect the way supervision is perceived.

INFLUENCE OF CURRENT FACTORS ON SUPERVISORY SERVICES

An Analysis of Current Factors Contributing to Perceptions of Supervisory Services

This study was conceived in order to test the impact of certain factors on the practice of supervision. The following factors were investigated: declining student populations, decentralization, management efficiency studies, collective bargaining, building principal's inability to give time to supervision and diminishing revenues. Further, an analysis was run of responses on the quantitative section of the study to isolate any supervisory practices that appeared related to perceptions of supervisory effectiveness. The results of these analyses are reported in this section of the study. Tables have been set up for each of the factors and the percent of respondents rating supervisory services as _adequate_ (_better_) or _inadequte_ (_poorer_) have been indicated. A differnce score has been calculated, subtracting the _inadequate_ (_poorer_)scores from the _adequate_ (_better_) ones. A positive difference score indicates a predominantly positive view; a negative difference score indicates a predominantly negative view.

Decentralization appeared to be associated with a positive perception of supervision by most groups (Table 1). Only officers of teachers' associations consistently produced negative difference scores (-38.5 and -38.5). By contrast, all groups except supervisors produced negative difference scores.

Level of collective bargaining did show some relationship to perceived supervisor effectiveness (Table 2). Meet and confer agreements were associated with the most consistently positive difference scores; districts with no bargaining agreement and districts with master contracts produced an equal

Table 1

Perceptions of Supervisory Effectiveness With Regard to Level of Decentralization

"Considered as a whole, how adequate are supervisory services that are available currently?"

	Centralized (Percent Responding)	Difference Scores	Decentralized (Percent Responding)	Difference Scores
Teachers				
High/Adequate	30.8	- 1.8	36.0	7.3
Low/Inadequate	32.6		28.7	
Teachers' Assoc. Officers				
High/Adequate	12.5	-37.6	7.7	-38.5
Low/Inadequate	50.1		46.2	
Supervisors				
High/Adequate	36.8	4.4	25.4	- 6.8
Low/Inadequate	32.4		32.2	
Principals				
High/Adequate	29.9	-4.4	29.2	6.2
Low/Inadequate	32.3		23.0	
Superintendents				
High/Adequate	33.3	-11.1	50.0	37.5
Low/Inadequate	44.4		12.5	

"Are supervisory services better or poorer than five years ago?"

Teachers				
High/Better	29.4	7.9	42.7	23.1
Low/Poorer	21.5		19.6	
Teachers' Assoc. Officers				
High/Better	25.0	-18.8	15.4	-38.5
Low/Poorer	43.8		53.9	
Supervisors				
High/Better	42.7	14.7	52.6	32.2
Low/Poorer	28.0		20.4	
Principals				
High/Better	37.3	8.9	41.7	14.6
Low/Poorer	28.4		27.1	
Superintendents				
High/Better	22.2	-22.2	75.0	75.0
Low/Poorer	44.4		----	

Table 2

Perceptions of Supervisory Effectiveness With Regard to Level of Collective Bargaining

"Considered as a whole, how adequate are supervisory services that are available currently?"

	Master Contract Percent Responding	Difference Scores	Meet & Confer Percent Responding	Diff. Scores	No Agreement % Responding	Diff. Scores
Teachers						
High/Adequate	30.7	- 0.3	38.1	7.6	31.2	- 0.8
Low/Inadequate	31.0		30.5		32.0	
Teachers' Assoc. Officers						
High/Adequate	----	-53.3	20.0	0.0	22.2	-33.3
Low/Inadequate	53.3		20.0		55.5	
Supervisors						
High/Adequate	30.3	- 5.2	40.5	13.5	14.2	-14.4
Low/Inadequate	35.5		27.0		28.6	
Principals						
High/Adequate	27.1	- 4.3	30.3	6.1	41.7	8.4
Low/Inadequate	31.4		24.2		33.3	
Superintendents						
High/Adequate	44.4	22.2	50.0	16.7	----	-50.0
Low/Inadequate	22.2		33.3		50.0	
"Are supervisory services better or poorer than five years ago?"						
Teachers						
High/Better	31.0	9.3	41.6	19.5	36.8	22.4
Low/Poorer	21.7		22.1		14.4	
Teachers' Assoc. Officers						
High/Better	26.7	-20.0	----	-40.0	22.2	-33.3
Low/Poorer	46.7		40.0		55.5	
Supervisors						
High/Better	40.7	9.1	59.4	48.6	50.0	28.6
Low/Poorer	31.6		10.8		21.4	
Principals						
High/Better	28.6	- 8.5	51.6	39.5	66.6	49.9
Low/Poorer	37.1		12.1		16.7	
Superintendents						
High/Better	44.4	22.2	66.7	50.0	----	-50.0
Low/Poorer	22.2		16.7		50.0	

number of negative difference scores.

The effect, if any, of decreasing revenue on perceptions of supervisory effectiveness was quite ambiguous (Table 3). A larger number of negative difference scores (although the negative scores were small for the most part) was associated with increase in revenue when current supervisory effectiveness was considered. However, when compared to five years before, increases in revenue were associated with all positive difference scores, contrasted with two negative difference scores in those districts with decreasing revenues.

The factor of building principals' inability to give time to supervison was judged by a proximate measure - comparing districts that had increased the number of principals with those that had decreased the number of principals. As may be seen in Table 4, this information did not yield a consistent picture. In districts which had increased the number of principals, four of five respondent groups produced a negative difference score for current adequacy of supervisory services; comparing current services with five years ago, respondent groups produced only one negative difference score. However, the districts with a decreased number of principals produced similar results - three negative difference scores for current services and two, comparing current services with five years ago.

The results of the management efficiency studies were unclear. The worst difference scores (Table 5) were produced by those districts that had conducted a study but either had not released or had not yet implemented the results. There was little variation in the difference scores of those districts that had conducted management studies, and those that had not. If it is accurate to state that districts tend to order studies when they are in trouble (as is suggested by the data for those districts that have received studies, but not

Table 3

Perceptions of Supervisory Effectiveness With Regard to Increases or Decreases in Revenue* During the Period 1974-1979

"Considered as a whole, how adequate are supervisory services that are available currently?"

	Increases (Percent Responding	Difference Scores	Decreases (Percent Responding)	Difference Scores
Teachers				
High/Adequate	29.2	- 2.0	34.9	2.8
Low/Inadequate	31.2		32.1	
Teachers' Assoc. Officers				
High/Adequate	12.5	-25.0	12.5	-25.0
Low/Inadequate	37.5		37.5	
Supervisors				
High/Adequate	32.8	- 1.7	30.4	----
Low/Inadequate	34.5		30.4	
Principals				
High/Adequate	28.6	- 3.6	31.4	----
Low/Inadequate	32.2		31.4	
Superintendents				
High/Adequate	40.0	10.0	50.0	25.0
Low/Inadequate	30.0		25.0	

"Are supervisory services better or poorer than five years ago?"

Teachers				
High/Better	32.8	11.7	37.0	18.0
Low/Poorer	21.1		19.0	
Teachers' Assoc. Officers				
High/Better	37.5	6.2	----	-50.0
Low/Poorer	31.3		50.0	
Supervisors				
High/Better	50.9	27.3	41.3	15.2
Low/Poorer	23.6		26.1	
Principals				
High/Better	33.9	1.8	51.5	37.2
Low/Poorer	32.1		14.3	
Superintendents				
High/Better	50.0	30.0	25.0	-25.0
Low/Poorer	20.0		50.0	

*Adjusted to a constant dollar figure

Table 4

Perceptions of Supervisory Effectiveness With Regard to Increases or Decreases in Number of Principals

"Considered as a whole, how adequate are supervisory services that are available currently?"

	Increases (Percent Responding)	Difference Scores	Decreases (Percent Responding)	Difference Scores
Teachers				
High/Adequate	28.8	- 7.5	32.0	4.5
Low/Inadequate	36.3		27.5	
Teachers' Assoc. Officers				
High/Adequate	11.1	-11.1	----	-50.0
Low/Inadequate	22.2		50.0	
Supervisors				
High/Adequate	41.7	22.6	28.4	- 8.1
Low/Inadequate	22.2		36.5	
Principals				
High/Adequate	26.7	- 4.4	26.9	- 3.9
Low/Inadequate	31.1		30.8	
Superintendents				
High/Adequate	----	-75.0	60.0	40.0
Low/Inadequate	75.0		20.0	

"Are supervisory services better or poorer than five years ago?"

	Increases (Percent Responding)	Difference Scores	Decreases (Percent Responding)	Difference Scores
Teachers				
High/Better	32.4	12.9	35.0	11.8
Low/Poorer	19.5		23.2	
Teachers' Assoc. Officers				
High/Better	33.3	11.1	25.0	-25.0
Low/Poorer	22.2		50.0	
Supervisors				
High/Better	47.3	27.8	47.3	21.6
Low/Poorer	19.5		25.7	
Principals				
High/Better	48.9	24.5	25.0	- 9.6
Low/Poorer	24.4		34.6	
Superintendents				
High/Better	----	- 75.0	70.0	60.0
Low/Poorer	75.0		10.0	

Table 5

Perceptions of Supervisory Effectiveness With Regard to Management Efficiency Studies by External Groups

"Considered as a whole, how adequate are supervisory services that are available currently?"

	Study Conducted (Percent Responding)	Difference Scores	Conducted - Not Released Percent Responding	Diff. Scores	Not Conducted (% Responding)	Diff. Scores
Teachers						
High/Adequate	32.4	- .4	25.9	- 5.5	38.4	9.1
Low/Inadequate	32.8		31.4		29.3	
Teachers' Assoc. Officers	----	-42.9	----	-----	14.3	-37.6
High/Adequate	42.9		----		52.4	
Low/Inadequate						
Supervisors						
High/Adequate	26.7	- 4.4	42.9	7.2	29.7	- 1.8
Low/Inadequate	31.1		35.7		31.5	
Principals						
High/Adequate	22.5	5.0	30.0	-10.0	35.6	2.3
Low/Inadequate	17.5		40.0		33.3	
Superintendents						
High/Adequate	71.4	57.1	33.3	-33.4	14.3	-14.3
Low/Inadequate	14.3		66.7		28.6	
"Are supervisory services better or poorer than five years ago?"						
Teachers						
High/Better	37.8	14.3	25.5	3.1	39.3	22.0
Low/Poorer	23.5		22.4		17.3	
Teachers' Assoc. Officers						
High/Better	28.6	----	100.0	100.0	14.3	-42.8
Low/Poorer	28.6		----		57.1	
Supervisors						
High/Better	48.9	24.5	46.4	- .1	46.1	23.9
Low/Poorer	24.4		46.5		22.2	
Principals						
High/Better	30.0	2.5	30.0	-10.0	53.3	33.3
Low/Poorer	27.5		40.0		20.0	
Superintendents						
High/Better	85.7	85.7	----	-66.7	28.6	----
Low/Poorer	----		66.7		28.6	

released or acted on the recommendations), then it may be that management efficiency studies serve a useful purpose in restoring a more positive perception of supervisory services.

Decreases in numbers of students does not seem to influence perceptions of supervisory services. Districts having increases in numbers of pupils produced four negative difference scores for current services and only one for services compared to five years ago (Table 6). However, districts experiencing decreases in students produced only two negative difference scores on current service and one on current services compared to five years ago.

Table 5

Perceptions of Supervisory Effectiveness With Regard to Increases or Decreases in Number of Pupils

"Considered as a whole, how adequate are supervisory services that are available currently?"

	Pupils Increased (Percent Responding)	Difference Scores	Pupils Decreased (Percent Responding)	Difference Scores
Teachers				
High/Adequate	31.2	- 2.1	32.4	2.4
Low/Inadequate	33.3		30.0	
Teachers' Assoc. Officers				
High/Adequate	12.5	-12.5	11.1	-38.9
Low/Inadequate	25.0		50.0	
Supervisors				
High/Adequate	42.1	15.7	28.3	- 5.7
Low/Inadequate	26.4		34.0	
Principals				
High/Adequate	17.3	-17.5	33.4	6.0
Low/Inadequate	34.8		27.4	
Superintendents				
High/Adequate	-----	-100.0	46.7	20.0
Low/Inadequate	100.0		26.7	

"Are supervisory services better or poorer than five years ago?"

Teachers				
High/Better	39.0	19.2	21.1	.6
Low/Poorer	19.8		20.5	
Teachers' Assoc. Officers				
High/Better	25.0	-----	22.2	-27.8
Low/Poorer	25.0		50.0	
Supervisors				
High/Better	47.4	31.6	47.1	21.6
Low/Poorer	15.8		25.5	
Principals				
High/Better	43.4	21.7	38.1	9.5
Low/Poorer	21.7		28.6	
Superintendents				
High/Better	-----	-100.0	46.6	26.6
Low/Poorer	100.0		20.0	

Summary

Supervision as perceived by teachers and officers of teachers' associations has not changed much over the past five years and only about one-third of the teachers feel that their current needs in areas of inservice education, teacher evaluation, curriculum improvement and instructional supervision are met to a substantial degree. By contrast, supervisors, superintendents and to a lesser degree principals perceive supervisory services as significantly improved compared to five years ago but again only meeting the needs of approximately one-third of the teachers to a substantial degree. This is one of the major conclusions of a study financed by ASCD in early 1979 to determine (1) the present status of supervison and (2) the impact of certain factors on the practice of supervision.

In answering these two questions a definition of supervision was adopted (the role of supervision consisting of inservice, teacher evaluation, curriculum improvement and instructional supervisory services, without regard to the title of the person who performs these functions and to include principals) and ultimately sixteen visits to urban, suburban and medium size city school districts conducted. Because of the small number of school districts in each category and the method in which the districts were selected, the findings of this study cannot be inferred to be representative of other districts; however, they may be considered as indicators and as raising points to be explored by other districts similarly situated.

The answer to the first question has already been partially supplied - the current status of supervisory services is not much changed in the last five years according to teachers and officers of teachers' associations, but is much improved according to other groups; and additionally, teachers and others tend to agree that as currently practiced only about one-third of the teachers have their needs met to a substantial degree. Confounding data lead to further inquiry about possible reasons for these results. On the one hand, a series of questions inquired about specific focuses for supervisory services -- the choices including high expectations of pupils, teacher enthusiasm, aid in the use of audio-visual materials, task orientation, individualizing instruction, classroom climate, abundance of materials, emphasis on pupil activity and the making of bulletin boards. All of these emphases, with the exception of audio-visual materials (some would dispute this) and bulletin boards have been found to be associated with improved pupil learning and all with the exception of audio-visual materials and bulletin boards were indicated as supervisory focuses by a majority of the respondents. So why the perception that teacher needs are largely not being met by these same respondents?

One hypothesis tested was that the explanation might be found in the methods used to carry out supervisory services. All groups agreed that the predominant vehicle for inservice continues to be the one day workshop or program. This in spite of the fact that one day workshops are considered to be generally ineffective. Much less visible were such inservice options as in-classroom assistance in adapting an innovative practice, observations of other teachers, special college courses conducted at a local school and independent projects as a part of a formal inservice program. Approximately one-third of the teachers in this survey reported being involved in one of these later inservice options in the last three years; by contrast, 50% or more of the supervisors, principals and superintendents reported involvement in the inservice options -- but clearly this level of participation is not penetrating to the classroom teacher.

This same adherence to conventional delivery systems was noted in responses to other parts of this study. For example, the overwhelming consensus from all respondents was that the predominant method of teacher evaluation is by a superior, most often the principal (90% of the teachers so indicated). Sixty percent of the teachers also indicated self evaluation was used. Other options, such as peer evalaution, student evaluation and evaluation of classroom climate (as opposed to evaluating the teacher) were reported by only 20% - 25% of the teachers. Supervisors, principals and superintendents tended to report a somewhat higher rate of evaluating classroom climate, about 50%; but if the level is indeed this high, many teachers are not aware of it.

A similar profile emerged when teachers were asked about the kinds of instructional supervision services they had received in the past three years. The most frequently reported service, reported by half of the teachers was an observation followed by a conference. Only 20% of the teachers reported receiving clinical supervision, the observation practice that has more support in research. Similarly, only about one-third of the teachers reported having supplementary materials or audio-visual materials or changes in teaching procedures recommended to them; by contrast, well over one-third indicated that they had received reinforcement for teaching approaches currently in use.

Principals and supervisors had a different view of their delivery of instructional supervision services, with, for example, over 50% reporting use of clinical supervision with several teachers during the past three years. Similarly, eighty percent of the principals and supervisors report recommending changes in teaching procedures; yet fewer than one-third of the teachers reported receiving recommendations. This trend of many more supervisors and principals reporting the delivery of services than teachers report receiving is generally characteristic of the responses on all parts of this report.

The final aspect of supervision investigated for purposes of this study, curriculum improvement, continued the pattern noted in the three previously discussed aspects of supervison -- generally low reported teacher participation, particularly in creative or innovative aspects of the service and conversely higher teacher participation in the more conventional, uncreative aspects. And further, higher participation reported by supervisors, principals and superintendents. With respect to curriculum improvement activities, over half the teachers reported participating in adapting a curriculum to a new text or materials. Other curriculum improvement activities such as developing new courses, writing competency criteria tests, developing new curriculum guides or selecting new curriculum programs were reported by only about one-third of the teachers. Following the pattern set in response to earlier questions already discussed, supervisors, principals and superintendents reported a higher level of participation in these creative activities, ranging from 50% - 75%.

A test was conducted to determine whether teachers who reported more involvement in more innovative supervisory services were also the ones who rated supervisory services higher. This did not prove to be the case. Rather, the test showed that teachers rating supervisory services higher generally reported a higher level of involvement in all supervisory services, both the traditional and less traditional. The message seems clear -- teachers who report receiving more supervisory services tend to feel to a higher degree that their needs are being met. Conversely, teachers who reported a lower level of involvement tended to report less satisfaction with supervisory services.

A final part of the questionnaire may provide an additional clue to the issue of only one-third of the teachers reporting their needs being met. Respondents were asked to indicate which organizational level had responsibility for the four supervisory functions. Only teacher evaluation was clearly indicated by a large majority as a sole responsibility of an organizational level -- the building level. The other three functions were felt to be shared responsibility between building, decentralized offices (where these existed) and central offices. In a sense, this is a hopeful trend in that an area like inservice is now seen as a shared responsibility whereas in the past it would likely have been viewed solely as a responsibility of the central office. Still, recalling that teachers note little improvement in supervisory services over the past five years, shared functions may not be yielding the hoped-for improvement. It may be well worth pursuing for districts to delegate even more authority to the building level as suggested by the widely reported Rand study on staff development.

The quantitative data reported above was supplemented by qualitative data gathered during site visits. Interviewers met with representatives of five respondent groups in each of the sixteen districts to solicit their thoughts and opinions on the state of supervisory practice. The sessions were open-ended and as such generated comments that did not necessarily interface with the questionnaire information discussed above. Those who saw an increase in supervisory services tended to cite a change in supervisory attitudes from evaluative to one of helping the teacher, an emphasis on accountability and special emphasis programs (such as reading, math) that focused the supervisory program. One group of respondents mentioned a building level emphasis as a contribution to improved supervisory services. Those who saw supervisory services in decline most often mentioned personnel cuts as the predominant factor. School officials might take special note that where supervisory services were perceived as improved due to a change in supervisory attitudes, those districts had made a concerted effort to redefine the role of supervision and this definition had penetrated to the implementation level. Not all districts attempting this change were successful, but where they were, the results were so perceived by all respondent categories. The critical factor that seemed to determine whether this redefinition penetrated to the implementation level seemed to be a commitment from top administration with training and follow-up provided. Site visits also uncovered a high level of demoralization from principals and supervisors as paperwork continued to increase (supervisors and principals) and they saw their ranks thinning (supervisors).

Turning to the second of the questions addressed by this study, the impact of certain factors on the practice of supervision, the following factors were investigated: declining student populations, decentralization, management efficiency studies, collective bargaining, building principals' inability to give time to supervision and diminishing revenues.

Declining student populations did not appear to be related to the practice of supervision as perceived by teachers. Of the teachers in the three districts with increasing student populations, approximately one-third of the teachers rated current supervisory services high and one-third rated them low. In the twelve school districts experiencing decreases, similar ratings were given. In comparing present supervisory services with those of five years ago, again the findings were similar. The qualitative data gathered during site visits supported the "no influence" conclusion with respect to declining student populations in general. However, Bailey, Fritschen and All (1978), Pack and

Weiss (1975) and Elam (1978) note that perhaps the best way to cope with declining student populations is through improved programs (such as special programs for the gifted), subsidiary services for students not on grade level, and services to adult populations. During site visits, some respondents mentioned "special emphasis" programs as one indicator of improved supervisory services, suggesting that the adjustments to declining student populations mentioned above are beginning to be set in place and are being enhanced by effective supervisory services.

Decentralization did appear to be related to perceptions of supervision as respondents in decentralized districts decidedly rated supervisory services higher than did those from centralized districts. Results from site visits were less clear in attributing improved supervisory services to decentralization, respondents being about equally divided on the question. It may be that with decentralization comes other changes (such as redefinition of the role of supervision) and it is these changes that influence the perception of improved supervisory services. Bassett (1977) and Fisher (1977), for example, have suggested that as a district decentralizes, there is also a noticeable shift from an emphasis on formalism and technical matters to an emphasis on meaning, communication and personal relationships. Respondents during the site visit may have perceived the benefits of decentralization that Bassett and Fisher mention, but fail to make the connection with decentralization as such.

The effect of management efficiency studies on perceptions of supervisory effectiveness, revealed similar ratings of supervisory services both for those districts that had conducted studies and those that had not. Districts that had ordered the studies, but had not yet released or implemented the findings tended to yield lower scores on effectiveness of supervisory services. Data gathered during site visits did not really clarify the matter, providing mixed support for the role of management effectiveness studies. It may be that districts in trouble tend to order management studies resulting in those that have not ordered studies and those that have implemented the findings, scoring equally; whereas those that have not implemented the findings continue to be in trouble. Perhaps it is best to state that apparently they caused little harm in the school districts included in this study as far as perceptions of the effectiveness of supervisory services.

Level of collective bargaining did seem to be related to supervisory services perceptions with meet and confer agreements showing the most positive relation, followed by no formal agreement and collective bargaining agreement districts. These rather persuasive results are confounded by responses gathered during site vists that suggested there were no relationships (exception - principals did think there was a negative relationship). A review of the literature had suggested that the relationship was unclear with Nighswander and Klahn, (1977) and McConnell and Pascal (1979) on the one hand suggesting no influence (or even a slightly positive influence) and Flam (1971), Lieberman (1979) and Eiken (1977) on the other, seeing a very negative influence. The way out of this mix of conflicting data may be provided by Karlitz (1978) who suggests that collective bargaining goes through a maturing process over the years that ultimately results in an accommodation stage where both parties give a bit rather than precisely observing contract provisions. Those respondents reporting "no influence" of collective bargaining on supervisory services may be in situations where collective bargaining has had an opportunity to mature.

Building principal's ability to give time to supervisory services was addressed by using a proximate measure - that is, by comparing responses from school districts that had increased the number of principals with those that had decreased the number of principals. This analysis yielded a conclusion of no influence on supervisory services. However, during site visits respondents did note as a positive development -- the assumption of supervisory services by other groups, including principals. And further, a closer analysis of results from the districts showing increases and decreases in principals yielded a positive perception on current supervisory services compared to five years ago by principals in increasing districts and a negative score by principals in decreasing districts. Site visits yielded a mixed response on the principal's ability to provide instructional support services with the exception of suburban districts which reported a positive influence on supervisory services. Many interviewers noted that time was a problem, but in those situations where time is available (or made) the results seem to be predominantly positive. Studies have suggestd that principals themselves are ambivalent on the question of their role in instructional leadership with a North Central Association study finding principals opting for their role as managers and a Texas study (Purkerson, 1977) finding them strongly endorsing their role as instructional leaders. Mazzarella (1977) indicates that principals fail to provide instructional leadership due to a lack of time, power, clear role definition and preparation. If Mazzarella's analysis is accurate, districts can immediately move to clarify the principal's instructional role and accord him the power to implement it. However, it is equally clear that time will have to be provided (perhaps by a reduction in other responsibilities) and thorough training in the roles expected will have to be provided.

The question of the influence of diminishing revenues on supervisory services produced some confusing results. Of the sixteen districts studied, nine recorded increases in per pupil expenditures, even when these figures were adjusted for inflation. Yet, the widely expressed view during site visits was that revenues had decreased. This may in part be explained by the fact that as enrollments decline, total revenues decline while fixed expenses continue at nearly the same level, thus reducing the total available for variable expenses. An analysis of the quantitative data, produced no clear-cut relationship between revenues and exception of supervisory services. Site visits, by contrast, revealed strong perceptions of associations between budget declines and supervisory services for urban and suburban districts but unclear relationships for medium size cities. It appears from the data available in this study that declining budgets do not automatically result in perceptions of diminished supervisory services, but that prudent management, well targeted services and, as reported by some respondents, special emphasis programs can enhance perceptions of supervisory services.

As a further probe for any other influences on supervisory services, during site visits interviewers were asked to list additional influences on supervisory services. The following were suggestd by a number of respondents: reorganizing the delivery of supervisory services and redefining the role of supervisor (positive influence), accountability (positive influence), state mandated programs (mixed influence), public pressure (negative influence), building level emphasis on supervisory services (positive influence), and lack of time (negative influence).

This study of supervisory services commissioned by ASCD has been timely. Clearly, supervisory services are being closely reviewed as districts experience pressures from a number of sources. The message from this study can be hopeful with respect to the future of supervisory services. Some one-third of the teachers feel their needs are being met, in spite of the retreat and decline of many potential influences on supervisory services. It is clear that districts have to assert the importance of supervisory services strongly and move imaginatively to assure improved services in a difficult time. Those moves with the highest potential impact are not out of the control of districts (such as declining students or being an urban district would be), with decentralization and building principal's further involvement in instructional matters being best bets. Reorganizing the delivery of supervisory services and redefining the role of supervisor also seems to hold potential where there is support and follow-through on this from the top administration. The finding in this study that the type of supervisory services (conventional as contrasted with less frequently used options) was not so much a factor in teacher perception of improved supervisory services as was the factor of participation (teachers who reported more involvement in any kind of services were much more likely to report that supervisory services meet their needs to a high degree) suggests we need more, not fewer supervisory services provided.

References

Bassett, G. W. *Educational Administration and the Professional Development of Teachers*. Paper presented at the National Conference of the Australian Council for Educational Administration, August 21-26, 1977. ED 146 670.

Bailey, J. D. Fritschen, L. E., and Ali, P. A. "Declining Enrollments: Advancing Concerns," *Compact* (Summer/Fall, 1978), 4-6.

Cawelti, G. "Urban School Decentralization and Curriculum Development," in *Impact of Decentralization on Curriculum*, I. Staples, ed. ASCD, 1975.

Eiken, K. P. "Teachers' Unions and the Curriculum Change Process," *Educational Leadership*, *XXXV* (December, 1977), 174-177.

Fisher, C. D. *"Professional Development" - Some Reflections by the Headmaster of an Independent School*. Paper presented at the National Conference of the Australian Council for Educational Administration, August 21-26, 1977. ED 146 672.

Flam, S. The Impact of Professional Negotiations on Contract Provisions for Teacher In-Service in Oakland County, Mich. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1971.

Elam, S. "Ways of Dealing with Enrollment Decline," *Phi Delta Kappan*, *LX* (September, 1978), 20-25.

Karlitz, Howard. "Educational Administrators and Teacher Unions: An Alliance of Convenience," *The Clearing House*, *LII* (November, 1978), 125-128.

Lieberman, M. "Rand's Study of Organized Teachers," *Phi Delta Kappan*, *LXI* (December, 1979), 256-258.

Mazzarella, J. *The Principal's Role as an Instructional Leader*. ACSA School Management Digest, Series 1, Number 3. ERIC/CEM Research Analysis Series #3. ED 137 895.

McDonnell, L. M. and Pascal, A. H. "A Reply to Myron Lieberman," *Phi Delta Kappan*, *LXI* (December, 1979), 258-259.

National Association of Elementary School Principals. Study of the Principalship. 1979.

Nighswander, J. K. and Klahn, R. P. "Teacher Collective Bargaining - A Survey of Administrators," *North Central Association Quartarly*, *LI* (Winter, 1977), 337-343.

Pack, K. and Weiss, E. H. "And, Specifically How to Make Productive Use Out of All that Yawning Space," The American School Board Journal, CXLVIII (June, 1975), 44.

Purkerson, R. "Wasted Days and Wasted Nights," NASSP Bulletin, LXI (December, 1977), 26-29.

Roe, W. and Drake, T. The Principalship. New York: Macmillan, 1974.

Stewart, D. A. and Miskel, C. Changing the Organizational Structure to Affect Perceived Bureaucracy, Organizational Processes, Loyalty, Job Satisfaction, and Effectiveness. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 4-8, 1977. ED 136 423.

U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Center for Education Statistics. Statistics of Public Elementary and Secondary Day Schools, Fall 1970 and Fall 1975. Washington, D. C., HEW, 1976.

U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Center for Education Statistics. Projections of Education Statistics to 1986-87. Washington, D. C., H.E.W., 1977.

Appendix A

Members of the A.S.C.D. Team that Designed the Study

Dr. Charles A. Reavis, Director of the Study	Texas Tech
Dr. Robert H. Anderson	Texas Tech
Dr. Ralph Arroyo	California State at Los Angeles
Dr. Gordon Cawelti	A.S.C.D.
Dr. Bruce Howell	University of Tulsa
Dr. James Huge	Natrona County Public Schools
Dr. Marcia Knoll	Forest Hills Elementary School
Mrs. Cathy Ralfs	Amarillo Public Schools
Dr. Charles Stallard	Old Domonion University

Appreciation is expressed to Dr. Ruth Long and Dr. Ron Brandt, both of A.S.C.D., who conducted site visits together with the A.S.C.D. team.

Appendix B

Participating School Districts

Large City

Baltimore, Maryland
Columbus, Ohio
Dallas, Texas
Denver, Colorado
Detroit, Michigan
San Diego, California
Seattle, Washington

Medium City

Charlotte, North Carolina
Des Moines, Iowa
Greece, New York
Huntsville, Alabama
Norfolk, Virginia
Salem, Oregon

Suburban

Cherry Creek, Colorado
Richardson, Texas
Scarsdale, New York

Appendix C

TEACHER* QUESTIONNAIRE

ASCD SUPERVISION/INSTRUCTION STUDY

The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development is conducting a study on Organizing Schools for Supervision/Instructional Improvement. This questionnaire is a major part of that study. Results of the study will be made available to your school superintendent as a resource to improve the supervisory services you receive. No teacher, school, or school district will be identified in reporting the results; however, each superintendent will learn how his district responded in comparison with other districts in the sample. It is most important that we have a response from each teacher. Will you please take five minutes right now to complete and return this questionnaire.

Please circle the appropriate identifying information:

14. Type of area:
    (1) Large urban (over 50,000 students in schools)
    (2) Suburban (located close to a large urban area)
    (3) Medium size city

15. Number of years teaching
    (1) 5-10
    (2) 11-15
    (3) 16+

16. School level presently teaching (circle all that apply):
    (1) Early childhood
    (2) Primary
    (3) Upper elementary
    (4) Middle school
    (5) Junior high school
    (6) Senior high school
    (7) Other (please describe): ______________________________

---

*Five or more years' experience in your present school system.

17. Highest degree held:
    (1) Bachelor's
    (2) Master's
    (3) Master's + 30 semester hours
    (4) Doctorate

18. What major IN-SERVICE activities have you been involved in during the last three years? Circle all that apply.
    (1) One-day workshops, demonstrations conducted by public school personnel
    (2) Presentation by education sales representatives
    (3) One-day programs conducted by outside consultants
    (4) In-classroom assistance in adapting an innovative practice or using new materials
    (5) Observations of teachers in other schools/your school
    (6) Special college courses conducted at a local school by a college staff member
    (7) Workshops, demonstrations lasting more than one day and conducted by either local or outside consultants
    (8) Independent projects which are part of a formal in-service program
    (9) Other (please list): ______________________________
    ____

19. What major TEACHER EVALUATION activities have you been involved in during the last three years? Circle all that apply.
    (1) Evaluation by superior
    (2) Peer evaluation
    (3) Self evaluation
    (4) Evaluation by pupils
    (5) Evaluation of classroom climate (as opposed to evaluation of the teacher)
    (6) Other (please list): ______________________________
    ____

20. What major formally organized CURRICULUM IMPROVEMENT activities have you been involved in during the last three years? Circle all that apply.
    (1) Developing new courses
    (2) Writing competency criteria tests
    (3) Adapting a curriculum to new materials, text, or approaches
    (4) Developing new curriculum guides, resource units
    (5) Selecting a new curriculum program
    (6) Other (please state): ______________________________
    ____

21. What major INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION SERVICES have you been the recipient of during the last three years? Circle all that apply.
    (1) Clinical supervision (a conference before the observation in which a focus for the observation is identified, followed by the observation, then a follow-up conference)
    (2) Observation followed by a conference
    (3) Supplementary materials recommended to you as a result of a knowledge of your instructional goals, problems
    (4) Audio-visual materials recommended to you as a result of a knowledge of your instructional goals, problems
    (5) Changes in teaching procedures, approaches
    (6) Reinforcement for teaching procedures, approaches you currently use
    (7) Other (please state): ____
    ____

22. To what extent do current IN-SERVICE activities meet your needs?

Low High
1 2 3 4 5

23. To what extent does the current TEACHER EVALUATION program meet your needs?

Low High
1 2 3 4 5

24. To what extent do the current system CURRICULUM IMPROVEMENT efforts meet your needs?

Low High
1 2 3 4 5

25. To what extent does the current level of system INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION SERVICES meet your needs?

Low High
1 2 3 4 5

26. Considered as a whole, how adequate are SUPERVISORY SERVICES that are available to you currently?

Excellent Poor
1 2 3 4 5

Please think of some event that occurred during the academic year 1974-1975. It might be the birth of a child, the year your school won the championship, etc. Write that event here: ____. Now, with the year clearly established in your mind, please circle the answers to the following questions, 27-31.

27. To what extent do IN-SERVICE ACTIVITIES meet your needs compared to five years ago?

Low High
1 2 3 4 5

28. To what extent does the TEACHER EVALUATION program meet your needs compared to five years ago?

Low High
1 2 3 4 5

29. To what extent do the system CURRICULUM IMPROVEMENT efforts meet your needs compared to five years ago?

Low High
1 2 3 4 5

30. To what extent do the INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION SERVICES meet your needs compared to five years ago?

Low High
1 2 3 4 5

31. Are SUPERVISORY SERVICES better or poorer than five years ago?

Better Poorer
1 2 3 4 5

Which of the factors below have been the FOCUS OF INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT EFFORTS by principals, supervisors, or others with supervisory responsibilities?

Yes	No		
___	___	32.	High expectations of pupils by teachers
___	___	33.	Teacher enthusiasm
___	___	34.	Instruction in the use of audio-visual materials, equipment
___	___	35.	Emphasis on task orientation by teachers
___	___	36.	Individualizing instruction
___	___	37.	Classroom climate of warmth, support, mutual respect
___	___	38.	Abundance of materials in classrooms available for use by teachers and pupils
___	___	39.	Emphasis on pupil activities in classroom vs. pupil passivity
___	___	40.	The making and use of bulletin boards

41. What RESTRICTIONS exist which most inhibit the provision of supervisory services? (List all that apply)

42. What MOTIVATORS exist which most encourage the provision of supervisory services? (List all that apply)

43. Please provide any OTHER COMMENTS you wish regarding supervisory services.

Please respond to this item by rating the extent to which you feel the indicated responsibility is actually assumed at the various levels of your school organization, using the following scale:

1 -- Primary or sole responsibility
2 -- Shared responsibility
3 -- Limited or no responsibility
4 -- Not applicable - district is not decentralized

For example, if you felt the central office had limited or no responsibility for staff development, you would place a "3" in the appropriate space. Please give a rating to each level (i.e., all spaces should have a number).

	Central Office	Decentralized Area or District Offices	Building Principal
44. Staff Development			
45. Curriculum Improvement Projects			
46. Instructional Supervision			
47. Teacher Evaluation			

AFTER COMPLETING THIS, PLACE IN ATTACHED ENVELOPE, SEAL, AND RETURN TO YOUR PRINCIPAL.

SUPERVISOR* QUESTIONNAIRE

ASCD SUPERVISION/INSTRUCTION STUDY

The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development is conducting a study on Organizing Schools for Supervision/Instructional Improvement. This questionnaire is a major part of that study. Results of the study will be made available to your school superintendent as a resource to improve supervisory services. No supervisor, school, or school district will be identified in reporting the results; however, each superintendent will learn how his district responded in comparison with other districts in the sample. It is most important that we have a response from each supervisor. Will you please take five minutes right now to complete and return this questionnaire.

Please circle the appropriate identifying information:

14. Type of area:
    (1) Large urban (over 50,000 students in schools)
    (2) Suburban (located close to a large urban area)
    (3) Medium size city

15. Number of years supervising:
    (1) 5-10
    (2) 11-15
    (3) 16+

16. School level presently supervising in (circle all that apply):
    (1) Early childhood
    (2) Primary
    (3) Upper elementary
    (4) Middle school
    (5) Junior high school
    (6) Senior high school
    (7) Other (please describe): ____________________

---

*Five years' or more experience as a supervisor in your present school system.

17. Highest degree held:
    (1) Bachelor's
    (2) Master's
    (3) Master's + 30 semester hours
    (4) Doctorate

18. What major IN-SERVICE activities have you been involved in (either planning or as presenter or recipient) during the last three years? Circle all that apply.
    (1) One-day workshops, demonstrations conducted by public school personnel
    (2) Presentation by education sales representatives
    (3) One-day programs conducted by outside consultants
    (4) In-classroom assistance in adapting an innovative practice or using new materials
    (5) Observations of teachers in other schools/your school
    (6) Special college courses conducted at a local school by a college staff member
    (7) Workshops, demonstrations lasting more than one day and conducted by either local or outside consultants
    (8) Independent projects by teachers which are part of a formal in-service program
    (9) Other (please list): ______________________________
    ____

19. What major TEACHER EVALUATION activities have you been involved in (either planning or conducting) during the last three years? Circle all that apply.
    (1) Evaluation of teachers by supervisor
    (2) Teacher peer evaluation
    (3) Teacher self evaluation
    (4) Evaluation of teachers by pupils
    (5) Evaluation of classroom climate (as opposed to evaluation of the teacher) by supervisor
    (6) Other (please list): ______________________________
    ____

20. What major CURRICULUM IMPROVEMENT activities have you been involved in (either planning or conducting) during the last three years? Circle all that apply.
    (1) Developing new courses
    (2) Writing competency criteria tests
    (3) Adapting a curriculum to new materials, text, or approaches
    (4) Developing new curriculum guides, resource units
    (5) Selecting a new curriculum program
    (6) Other (please state): ______________________________
    ____

21. What major INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION SERVICES have you provided to several teachers during the last three years? Circle all that apply.
    (1) Clinical supervision (a conference before the observation in which a focus for the observation is identified, followed by the observation, then a follow-up conference)
    (2) Observation followed by a conference
    (3) Supplementary materials recommended by you as a result of a knowledge of teacher goals, problems
    (4) Audio-visual materials recommended by you as a result of a knowledge of teacher goals, problems
    (5) Changes in teaching procedures, approaches for individual teachers
    (6) Reinforcement for exhibited teaching procedures, or approaches for individual teachers

22. To what extent do current IN-SERVICE activities meet teacher needs?

Low				High
1	2	3	4	5

23. To what extent does the current TEACHER EVALUATION program meet the needs of your teachers?

Low				High
1	2	3	4	5

24. To what extent do the current system CURRICULUM IMPROVEMENT efforts meet the needs of your teachers?

Low				High
1	2	3	4	5

25. To what extent does the current level of system INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION SERVICES meet the needs of your teachers?

Low				High
1	2	3	4	5

26. Considered as a whole, how adequate are SUPERVISORY SERVICES that are currently available to the teachers in your district?

Excellent				Poor
1	2	3	4	5

Please think of some event that occurred during the academic year 1974-1975. It might be the birth of a child, the year your school won the championship, etc. Write that event here: ______________________________________. Now, with the year clearly established in your mind, please circle the answers to the following questions, 27-31.

27. To what extent do IN-SERVICE ACTIVITIES meet teacher needs compared to five years ago?

Low High
1 2 3 4 5

28. To what extent does the TEACHER EVALUATION program meet teacher needs compared to five years ago?

Low High
1 2 3 4 5

29. To what extent do the system CURRICULUM IMPROVEMENT efforts meet teacher needs compared to five years ago?

Low High
1 2 3 4 5

30. To what extent do the INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION SERVICES meet teacher needs compared to five years ago?

Low High
1 2 3 4 5

31. Are SUPERVISORY SERVICES better or poorer than five years ago?

Better Poorer
1 2 3 4 5

Which of the factors below have been the FOCUS OF INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT EFFORTS by principals, supervisors, or others with supervisory responsibilities?

Yes	No	
___	___	32. High expectations of pupils by teachers
___	___	33. Teacher enthusiasm
___	___	34. Instruction in the use of audio-visual materials, equipment
___	___	35. Emphasis on task orientation by teachers
___	___	36. Individualizing instruction
___	___	37. Classroom climate of warmth, support, mutual respect
___	___	38. Abundance of materials in classrooms available for use by teachers and pupils
___	___	39. Emphasis on pupil activities in classroom vs. pupil passivity
___	___	40. The making and use of bulletin boards

41. What RESTRICTIONS exist which most inhibit the provision of supervisory services? (List all that apply)

____

____

____

42. What MOTIVATORS exist which most encourage the provision of supervisory services? (List all that apply)

____

____

____

43. Please provide any OTHER COMMENTS you wish regarding supervisory services.

____

____

Please respond to this item by rating the extent to which you feel the indicated responsibility is actually assumed at the various levels of your school organization, using the following scale:

1 -- Primary or sole responsibility
2 -- Shared responsibility
3 -- Limited or no responsibility
4 -- Not applicable - district is not decentralized

For example, if you felt the central office had limited or no responsibility for staff development, you would place a "3" in the appropriate space. Please give a rating to each level (i.e., all spaces should have a number).

	Central Office	Decentralized Area or District Offices	Building Principal
44. Staff Development	______	______	______
45. Curriculum Improvement Projects	______	______	______
46. Instructional Supervision	______	______	______
47. Teacher Evaluation	______	______	______

PRINCIPAL* QUESTIONNAIRE

ASCD SUPERVISION/INSTRUCTION STUDY

The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development is conducting a study on Organizing Schools for Supervision/Instructional Improvement. This questionnaire is a major part of that study. Results of the study will be made available to your school superintendent as a resource to improve supervisory services. No principal, school, or school district will be identified in reporting the results; however, each superintendent will learn how his district responded in comparison with other districts in the sample. It is most important that we have a response from each principal. Will you please take five minutes right now to complete and return this questionnaire.

Please circle the appropriate identifying information:

14. Type of area:
    (1) Large urban (over 50,000 students in schools)
    (2) Suburban (located close to a large urban area)
    (3) Medium size city

15. Number of years as principal:
    (1) 5-10
    (2) 11-15
    (3) 16+

16. School level presently serving as principal (circle all that apply):
    (1) Early childhood
    (2) Primary
    (3) Upper elementary
    (4) Middle school
    (5) Junior high school
    (6) Senior high school
    (7) Other (please describe): ____________________

---

*Five years' or more experience as a principal in your present school system.

17. Highest degree held:
    (1) Bachelor's
    (2) Master's
    (3) Master's + 30 semester hours
    (4) Doctorate

18. What major IN-SERVICE activities have you been involved in (either planning or as a presenter or recipient) during the last three years? Circle all that apply.
    (1) One-day workshops, demonstrations conducted by public school personnel
    (2) Presentation by education sales representatives
    (3) One-day programs conducted by outside consultants
    (4) In-classroom assistance in adapting an innovative practice or using new materials
    (5) Observations of teachers in other schools/your school
    (6) Special college courses conducted at a local school by a college staff member
    (7) Workshops, demonstrations lasting more than one day and conducted by either local or outside consultants
    (8) Independent projects by teachers which are part of a formal in-service program
    (9) Other (please list): ______________________________
    ____

19. What major TEACHER EVALUATION activities have you been involved in (either planning or conducting) during the last three years? Circle all that apply.
    (1) Evaluation of teacher by principal
    (2) Teacher peer evaluation
    (3) Teacher self evaluation
    (4) Evaluation of teacher by pupils
    (5) Evaluation of classroom climate (as opposed to evaluation of the teacher) by principal
    (6) Other (please list): ______________________________
    ____

20. What major CURRICULUM IMPROVEMENT activities have you been involved in (either planning or conducting) during the last three years? Circle all that apply.
    (1) Developing new courses
    (2) Writing competency criteria tests
    (3) Adapting a curriculum to new materials, text, or approaches
    (4) Developing new curriculum guides, resource units
    (5) Selecting a new curriculum program
    (6) Other (please state): ______________________________
    ____

21. What major INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION SERVICES have you provided to several teachers during the last three years? Circle all that apply.
    (1) Clinical supervision (a conference before the observation in which a focus for the observation is identified, followed by the observation, then a follow-up conference)
    (2) Observation followed by a conference
    (3) Supplementary materials recommended by you as a result of a knowledge of teacher goals, problems
    (4) Audio-visual materials recommended by you as a result of a knowledge of teacher goals, problems
    (5) Changes in teaching procedures, approaches for individual teachers
    (6) Reinforcement for exhibited teaching procedures, or approaches for individual teachers
    (7) Other (please state): ______________________________
    ____

22. To what extent do current IN-SERVICE activities meet teacher needs?

Low High
1 2 3 4 5

23. To what extent does the current TEACHER EVALUATION program meet teacher needs?

Low High
1 2 3 4 5

24. To what extent do the current system CURRICULUM IMPROVEMENT efforts meet teacher needs?

Low High
1 2 3 4 5

25. To what extent does the current level of system INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION SERVICES meet teacher needs?

Low High
1 2 3 4 5

26. Considered as a whole, how adequate are SUPERVISORY SERVICES that are available to teachers currently?

Excellent Poor
1 2 3 4 5

Please think of some event that occurred during the academic year 1974-1975. It might be the birth of a child, the year your school won the championship, etc. Write that event here: ____. Now, with the year clearly established in your mind, please circle the answers to the following questions, 27-31.

27. To what extent do IN-SERVICE ACTIVITIES meet teacher needs compared to five years ago?

Low High
1 2 3 4 5

28. To what extent does the TEACHER EVALUATION program meet teacher needs compared to five years ago?

Low High
1 2 3 4 5

29. To what extent do the system CURRICULUM IMPROVEMENT efforts meet teacher needs compared to five years ago?

Low High
1 2 3 4 5

30. To what extent do the INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION SERVICES meet teacher needs compared to five years ago?

Low High
1 2 3 4 5

31. Are SUPERVISORY SERVICES better or poorer than five years ago?

Better Poorer
1 2 3 4 5

Which of the factors below have been the FOCUS OF INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT EFFORTS by principals, supervisors, or others with supervisory responsibilities?

Yes No
___ ___ 32. High expectations of pupils by teachers
___ ___ 33. Teacher enthusiasm
___ ___ 34. Instruction in the use of audio-visual materials, equipment
___ ___ 35. Emphasis on task orientation by teachers
___ ___ 36. Individualizing instruction
___ ___ 37. Classroom climate of warmth, support, mutual respect
___ ___ 38. Abundance of materials in classrooms available for use by teachers and pupils
___ ___ 39. Emphasis on pupil activities in classroom vs. pupil passivity
___ ___ 40. The making and use of bulletin boards

41. What RESTRICTIONS exist which most inhibit the provision of supervisory services? (List all that apply)

____

____

____

42. What MOTIVATORS exist which most encourage the provision of supervisory services? (List all that apply)

____

____

____

43. Please provide any OTHER COMMENTS you wish regarding supervisory services.

____

____

____

Please respond to this item by rating the extent to which you feel the indicated responsibility is actually assumed at the various levels of your school organization, using the following scale:

1 -- Primary or sole responsibility
2 -- Shared responsibility
3 -- Limited or no responsibility
4 -- Not applicable - district is not decentralized

For example, if you felt the central office had limited or no responsibility for staff development, you would place a "3" in the appropriate space. Please give a rating to each level (i.e., all spaces should have a number).

	Central Office	Decentralized Area or District Offices	Building Principal
44. Staff Development	______	______	______
45. Curriculum Improvement Projects	______	______	______
46. Instructional Supervision	______	______	______
47. Teacher Evaluation	______	______	______

ASSISTANT (ASSOCIATE) SUPERINTENDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

ASCD SUPERVISION/INSTRUCTION STUDY

The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development is conducting a study on Organizing Schools for Supervision/Instructional Improvement. This questionnaire is a major part of that study. Results of the study will be made available to your school superintendent as a resource to improve supervisory services. No assistant (associate) superintendent, school, or school district will be identified in reporting the results; however, each superintendent will learn how his district responded in comparison with other districts in the sample.

Please circle the appropriate identifying information:

14. Type of area:
    (1) Large urban (over 50,000 students in schools)
    (2) Suburban (located close to a large urban area)
    (3) Medium size city

15. Number of years as assistant (associate) superintendent:
    (1) 1
    (2) 2-5
    (3) 6-10
    (4) 11-15
    (5) 16+

16. School level(s) for which you are presently responsible (circle all that apply):
    (1) Early childhood
    (2) Primary
    (3) Upper elementary
    (4) Middle school
    (5) Junior high school
    (6) Senior high school
    (7) Other (please describe): ______________________________

17. Highest degree held:
    (1) Bachelor's
    (2) Master's
    (3) Master's + 30 semester hours
    (4) Doctorate

18. What major IN-SERVICE activities have you been involved in (planned, conducted, or been the recipient of) during the last three years? Circle all that apply.
    (1) One-day workshops, demonstrations conducted by public school personnel
    (2) Presentation by education sales representatives
    (3) One-day programs conducted by outside consultants
    (4) In-classroom assistance in adapting an innovative practice or using new materials
    (5) Observations of teachers in other schools/your school
    (6) Special college courses conducted at a local school by a college staff member
    (7) Workshops, demonstrations lasting more than one day and conducted by either local or outside consultants
    (8) Independent projects by teachers which are part of a formal in-service program
    (9) Other (please list): ______________________________
    ____

19. What major TEACHER EVALUATION activities has the district initiated or continued during the last three years? Circle all that apply.
    (1) Evaluation by superior
    (2) Peer evaluation
    (3) Self evaluation
    (4) Evaluation by pupils
    (5) Evaluation of classroom climate (as opposed to evaluation of the teacher)
    (6) Other (please list): ______________________________
    ____

20. What major CURRICULUM IMPROVEMENT activities has the district initiated or continued during the last three years? Circle all that apply.
    (1) Developing new courses
    (2) Writing competency criteria tests
    (3) Adapting a curriculum to new materials, text, or approaches
    (4) Developing new curriculum guides, resource units
    (5) Selecting a new curriculum program
    (6) Other (please state): ______________________________
    ____

21. What major INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION SERVICES has the district initiated or continued during the last three years? Circle all that apply.
    (1) Clinical supervision (a conference before the observation in which a focus for the observation is identified, followed by the observation, then a follow-up conference)
    (2) Observation followed by a conference
    (3) Supplementary materials recommended to individual teachers as a result of a knowledge of teacher goals, problems
    (4) Audio-visual materials recommended to individual teachers as a result of a knowledge of teacher goals, problems
    (5) Changes in teaching procedures, approaches for individual teachers
    (6) Reinforcement for exhibited teaching procedures, or approaches for individual teachers
    (7) Other (please state): ____
    ____

22. To what extent do current IN-SERVICE activities meet teacher needs?

Low High
1 2 3 4 5

23. To what extent does the current TEACHER EVALUATION program meet teacher needs?

Low High
1 2 3 4 5

24. To what extent do the current system CURRICULUM IMPROVEMENT efforts meet teacher needs?

Low High
1 2 3 4 5

25. To what extent does the current level of system INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION SERVICES meet teacher needs?

Low High
1 2 3 4 5

26. Considered as a whole, how adequate are SUPERVISORY SERVICES that are available to teachers currently?

Excellent Poor
1 2 3 4 5

Please think of some event that occurred during the academic year 1974-1975. It might be the birth of a child, the year your school system was integrated, etc. Write that event here: ______________________________________. Now, with the year clearly established in your mind, please circle the answers to the following questions, 27-31.

27. To what extent do IN-SERVICE ACTIVITIES meet teacher needs compared to five years ago?

Low   High
1   2   3   4   5

28. To what extent does the TEACHER EVALUATION program meet teacher needs compared to five years ago?

Low   High
1   2   3   4   5

29. To what extent do the system CURRICULUM IMPROVEMENT efforts meet teacher needs compared to five years ago?

Low   High
1   2   3   4   5

30. To what extent do the INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION SERVICES meet teacher needs compared to five years ago?

Low   High
1   2   3   4   5

31. Are SUPERVISORY SERVICES better or poorer than five years ago?

Better   Poorer
1   2   3   4   5

Which of the factors below have been the FOCUS OF INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT EFFORTS by principals, supervisors, or others with supervisory responsibilities?

Yes	No	
___	___	32. High expectations of pupils by teachers
___	___	33. Teacher enthusiasm
___	___	34. Instruction in the use of audio-visual materials, equipment
___	___	35. Emphasis on task orientation by teachers
___	___	36. Individualizing instruction
___	___	37. Classroom climate of warmth, support, mutual respect
___	___	38. Abundance of materials in classrooms available for use by teachers and pupils
___	___	39. Emphasis on pupil activities in classroom vs. pupil passivity
___	___	40. The making and use of bulletin boards

41. What RESTRICTIONS exist which most inhibit the provision of supervisory services? (List all that apply)

____

____

____

42. What MOTIVATORS exist which most encourage the provision of supervisory services? (List all that apply)

____

____

____

43. Please provide any OTHER COMMENTS you wish regarding supervisory services.

____

____

____

Please respond to this item by rating the extent to which you feel the indicated responsibility is actually assumed at the various levels of your school organization, using the following scale:

1 -- Primary or sole responsibility
2 -- Shared responsibility
3 -- Limited or no responsibility
4 -- Not applicable - district is not decentralized

For example, if you felt the central office had limited or no responsibility for staff development, you would place a "3" in the appropriate space. Please give a rating to each level (i.e., all spaces should have a number).

	Central Office	Decentralized Area or District Offices	Building Principal
44. Staff Development	____	____	____
45. Curriculum Improvement Projects	____	____	____
46. Instructional Supervision	____	____	____
47. Teacher Evaluation	____	____	____

Appendix D

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

ASCD SUPERVISION/INSTRUCTION STUDY

(To be used in interviews with all groups. Please record comments in the spaces provided after the interview is over, except for question #2.)

Circle one:

Person or group:

Superintendent	Teachers' organization officers
Associate (Assistant) Superintendent	Principal in building - elementary middle, junior high, senior high
Principals	
Supervisors	Teachers in building - elementary, middle, junior high, senior high

1. Have supervisory services increased, remained about the same, or declined during the last five years, and what do you think are the reasons? (Pause, use silence, let the respondent think.)

2. To what degree do you think any of the following factors are contributors to the increase, same level, or decline (say the one they chose in question #1) in supervisory services? (NOTE: Tell them the categories and check in the appropriate blank as they respond.)

	Substantial Effect	Some Effect	No Effect
Declining enrollments?			
Collective bargaining?			
~~Management efficiency?~~ Decent ?			
Building principal's ability to provide instructional support services?			
Diminishing revenues?			
Management efficiency studies by outside groups?			

3. Can you think of any other factors that may have made a contribution to the increase, same level, or decline (say the one they chose in question #1) in supervisory services?

Appendix E

SCHOOL DISTRICT DATA QUESTIONNAIRE

ASCD SUPERVISION/INSTRUCTION STUDY

(Leave with Associate or
Assistant Superintendent)

Please circle the appropriate identifying information:

Type of area:
(1) Large urban (over 50,000 students in schools)
(2) Suburban (located close to a large urban area)
(3) Medium size city

---

1. Per pupil expenditure (general fund) for the following years:

.48 1974-1975 ______________________
1975-1976 ______________________
1976-1977 ______________________
1977-1978 ______________________
1978-1979 ______________________

2. Number of teachers employed for the following years:

1974-1975 ______________________
1975-1976 ______________________
1976-1977 ______________________
1977-1978 ______________________
1978-1979 ______________________

3. Number of supervisory personnel (include all those who are employed full time to assist other teachers in the improvement of instruction, including, but not limited to, supervisors, helping teachers, visiting teachers, and so forth) for the following years:

1974-1975 ______________________
1975-1976 ______________________
1976-1977 ______________________
1977-1978 ______________________
1978-1979 ______________________

4. Number of principals employed for the following years:

1974-1975 ______________________________
1975-1976 ______________________________
1976-1977 ______________________________
1977-1978 ______________________________
1978-1979 ______________________________

5. Number of schools for the following years:

1974-1975 ______________________________
1975-1976 ______________________________
1976-1977 ______________________________
1977-1978 ______________________________
1978-1979 ______________________________

✓ 6. Number of students for the following years:

1974-1975 ______________________________
1975-1976 ______________________________
1976-1977 ______________________________
1977-1978 ______________________________
1978-1979 ______________________________

We are attempting to categorize the degree of various factors that exists in school systems in our sample. Please read the statements below and circle the statement that most nearly describes the level of your school system with respect to the factor indicated.

✓ 7. Decentralization:
   (1) Decentralization with regional office and regional committee acting in advisory capacity (appointed by the central board or chosen through a mechanism set by the board)
   (2) Decentralization with regional offices but not having regional "school boards"
   (3) No decentralization at this time

8. Collective Bargaining:
   (1) Master contract has been signed between the union representatives and the school system.
   (2) Meet and confer agreement has been signed (or is tacitly observed), but there are no "teeth" in agreements reached.
   (3) Teacher organizations appear before board from time to time, but negotiations as such, either formal or informal, do not exist.

9. Management Efficiency:
   (1) A management study on the instructional organization of this school district has been conducted during the past five years by an external organization. Please describe in the space below what impact this has had.

   (2) A management study on the instructional organization of this school district has not been conducted during the past five years by an external organization.

Appendix F

Summary - School District Data

Large City

District	Years	Per Pupil Expenditure	% I, S[a] or D	Number of Teachers	% I, S or D	Number of Supervisory Personnel	% I, S or D	Numbers of Principals	% I, S or D	Number of Schools	% I, S or D
A	1974	1,102		8,056		642		194		206	
	1979	1,637	(S)	7,496	73(D)	571	11(D)	193	(S)	202	1(D)
B	1974	1,048		4,025		375		243		164	
	1979	1,647	6(I)	3,214	20(D)	363[b]	3(D)	233	4(D)	164	(S)
C	1974	991		6,315		328		180		231	
	1979	1,745	19(I)	6,411	2(I)	435	33(I)	178	1(D)	195	16(D)
D	1974	1,687		4,379		141		116		122	
	1979	2,413	3(I)	4,207	4(D)	144	2(I)	125	8(I)	123	1(I)
E	1974	1,271		10,032		65		247		327	
	1979	1,993	6(I)	9,272	8(D)	92	42(I)	226	8(D)	292	11(D)
F	1974	1,187		4,862		348		162		163	
	1979	1,730	1(D)	5,050	4(I)	357	3(I)	170	5(I)	168	3(I)
G	1974	1,484		3,258		92		114		114	
	1979	1,980	9(D)	2,467	24(D)	60	35(D)	105	8(D)	105	8(D)

Number of students	% I, S or D	Decentralization	Collective Bargaining?	Management Study?
177,197 145,000	18(D)	YES	YES	NO
98,384 83,409	15(D)	NO	YES	YES[c]
135,000 132,061	2(D)	YES	IN PART	YES
79,670 68,174	14(D)	NO	YES	NO
255,272 220,042	14(D)	YES	YES	NO
123,542 116,053	6(D)	NO	YES	NO
69,025 53,885	22(D)	NO	YES	YES

Suburban

District	Years	Per Pupil Expenditure	% I, S or D	Number of Teachers	% I, S or D	Number of Supervisory Personnel	% I, S or D	Numbers of Principals	% I, S or D	Number of Schools	% I, S or D
H	1974	1,400		630		0		17		17	
	1979	2,000	3(D)	1,075	71(I)	0		28	65(I)	28	65(I)
I	1974	813		1,664[d]		21[d]		44[d]		38	
	1979	1,184	2(D)	1,832	10(I)	45	114(I)	47	6(I)	46	21(I)
J	1974	2,816		322		6		7		7	
	1979	3,701	11(D)	300	7(D)	5	17(D)	7	(S)	7	(S)

Medium-sized City

District	Years	Per Pupil Expenditure	% I, S or D	Number of Teachers	% I, S or D	Number of Supervisory Personnel	% I, S or D	Numbers of Principals	% I, S or D	Number of Schools	% I, S or D
K	1974	1,252		4,418		22		107		107	
	1979	1,709	8(D)	4,605	4(I)	112	409(I)	106	1(D)	106	1(D)
L	1974	1,273		2,114		26		66		70	
	1979	2,021	7(I)	2,061	1(D)	29	11(I)	61	7(D)	68	3(D)
M	1974	1,963		692		31		19		19	
	1979	2,867	1(D)	739	7(I)	31	(S)	19	(S)	19	(S)

Number of Students	% I, S or D	Decentralization	Collective Bargaining?	Management Study?
13,676 19,296	41(I)	NO	IN PART	NO
34,775 37,595	8(I)	YES	IN PART	NO
4,969 4,746	4(D)	No	YES	NO

Number of Students	% I, S or D	Decentralization	Collective Bargaining?	Management Study?
77,805 77,609	(S)	YES	NO	NO
39,244 34,339	12(D)	NO	YES	YES[c]
12,972 13,029	(S)	NO	YES	NO

Middle-Sized City (Cont.)

trict	Years	Per Pupil Expenditure	% I, S or D	Number of Teachers	% I, S or D	Number of Supervisory Personnel	% I, S or D	Numbers of Principals	% I, S or D	Number of Schools	% I, S or D
N	1974	1,221		1,260		19		43		43	
	1979	2,020	12(I)	1,140	10(D)	26	37(I)	45	5(I)	47	9(I)
O	1974	1,097		2,166		83		69		70	
	1979	1,637	(S)	2,132	2(D)	77	7(D)	67	3(D)	69	1(D)
P	1974	719		1,584		251		35		35	
	1979	1,179	11(I)	1,668	5(I)	362	44(I)	36	3(I)	36	3(I)

a. Calculated in terms of constant dollars
b. Different accounting method used 1974; 1979
c. Report not yet released or acted on
d. Begins with 1975 figures

Code - I = Increased; S = Same; D = Decreased

Number of Students	% I, S or D	Decentralization	Collective Bargaining?	Management Study?
21,727		YES	YES	YES
22,054	1(I)			
45,650		YES	IN PART	YES
38,294	16(D)			
33,698		NO	NO	YES[c]
30,457	10(D)			

Factors Which Have Been the Focus of Instructional Improvement by Supervisors

Related to High Achieving Schools

#32 High Expectations of Pupils by Teachers

#35 Emphasis on Task Orientation by Teacher

#37 Classroom Climate of Warmth, Support, and Mutual Respect

Not related to High Achieving Schools

#33 Teacher Enthusiasm

#34 Instruction in the use of AV

#36 Individualizing Instruction

#38 Abudance of Materials in Classrooms

#39 Emphasis on pupil activities vs. pupil passivity

#40 Making and use of Bulletin Boards

1. Only one of the significant factors related to high achievement was selected by any group. That was Climate

2. Task orientation and High Expectations were never in the top three choices of any group or school type.

3. Individualized Instruction was chosen as the second highest factor which was the focus of Instructional Improvement. (An unrelated factor to achievement as indicated by the Brookover study)

4. Other unrelated factors which were given a high priority were:

5. Pupil Activities vs. Pupil Passivity (Supervisors)
   Teacher Enthusiasm (Supts. and Principals)
   Bulletin Boards (Supts.)
   Abundant Materials (Superintendents)

6. Under Individualized Instruction:

   Large schools gave it top priority in three cases, except for teachers.

   Medium size schools gave it top priority in two cases, Supervisors and Supts.

7. Superintendents in Medium Size schools and Suburban schools had 4-5 top priorities, not just one priority.

Chart #1

PERCEPTION OF FOCUS OF INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT EFFORTS BY PRINCIPALS, SUPERVISORS, OR OFTHERS by Category of Respondents

LARGE CITY

Teachers	74%	Climate
	70%	Individualized Instruction (II)
Supervisors	85%	II
	82%	Pupil Activities (Y) vs. Pupil Passivity
Principals	88%	II
	86%	Climate
Superintendents	90%	II
	90%	Climate

MEDIUM SIZE CITY

Teachers	73%	Climate
	71%	II
Supervisors	80%	II
	89%	Climate
Principals	91%	Climate
	89%	II
Supts	100%	II
	100%	Teacher Enthusiasm
	100%	Pupil Activities vs. Passivity
	100%	Bulletin Boards

SUBURBAN

Teachers	78%	Climate
	77%	II
Supervisors	88%	Pupil Activities vs. Passivity
	79%	Climate
	79%	II
Principals	100%	Climate
	95%	Teacher Enthusiasm
Superintendents	100%	Teacher Enthusiasm
	100%	Climate
	100%	II
	100%	Materials
	100%	Pupil Activities vs. Passivity

Chart #2

	TEACHERS	SUPERVISORS	PRINCIPALS	SUPERINTENDENTS
LARGE	Climate	Individualized Instruction	Individualized Instruction	Individualized Instruction Climate
MEDIUM	Climate	Climate	Climate	Individualized Instruction Climate
SU[illegible]AN	Climate	Pupil Activities vs. Passivity	Climate	Individualized Instruction Climate

Role:

Teachers in all 3 school types perceived Climate as the primary factor in the focus of Instructional Improvement by supervisors.

Principals in 2 school types perceived climate as the primary factor in the focus of Instructional Improvement by supervisors.

Supervisors in 1 school type (Medium) perceived Climate as the primary factor....

Superintendents in 2 school types perceived climate as primary factor... along with other factors.

School Type:

Teachers, Supervisors, and Principals in Medium size schools saw Climate as the primary factor in the focus of Instructional Improvement.

Teachers, Principals, and Superintendents in Suburban schools saw Climate as a facotr in the focus of Instructional Improvement.